

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

For Reference

NOT TO BE TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM

Ex LIBRIS
UNIVERSITATIS
ALBERTAEensis





Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

<https://archive.org/details/Ewasiuk1966>

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE RELATIONSHIP OF ROLE PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS
TO SELECTED CHARACTERISTICS
OF SCHOOLS AND PRINCIPALS

by

DANIEL EWASIUK

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

JANUARY, 1966

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and
recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance,
a thesis entitled "The Relationship of Role Perceptions of
Principals to Selected Characteristics of Schools and
Principals" submitted by Daniel Ewasuk in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of
Education.

ABSTRACT

The main purposes of this study were (1) to determine if relationships exist between role perceptions of principals taken as independent variables and certain characteristics of the schools as described by the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and by teacher ratings, and (2) to determine if relationships exist between role perceptions of principals, taken as dependent variables, and other characteristics of the schools and of the principals. Role perceptions of principals were examined in four dimensions which are made up of bi-polarities or contradictory value emphases--the Status Dimension which involves the conflict between the success ideology and the equality ideology, the Authority Dimension which is concerned with the conflict between the values of dependence and independence, the Personal Dimension which is concerned with universalistic versus particularistic criteria for behavior, and the Means-Ends Dimension which involves the conflict between emphasis on getting the job done and emphasis on the process of achievement.

The data required for this study were obtained from 1702 teachers, 185 schools and 183 principals; the instruments used were the OCDQ and a Principal's Questionnaire. Data were transferred to IBM punch cards and a computer was used for standardization of scores, determination of school climates, analysis of variance, Pearson product-moment correlations, multiple correlation, and "t" tests.

Eleven hypotheses were tested.

Principals' scores in the four dimensions of role perception were unrelated to school climate. When the eight subtests of the UCDQ and the four dimensions of role perception were examined only two relationships were found--weak negative relationships between the Status Dimension and Esprit and between the Personal Dimension and Disengagement. Teacher ratings of school effectiveness were related to the Personal Dimension, but ratings of teacher satisfaction and effectiveness of principals were independent of the principal's scores in the four dimensions of role perception.

When role perceptions were taken as dependent variables it was found that there were no significant relationships between school size and role perceptions of principals. The type of school was significantly related to scores in the Personal Dimension, but not to the other three dimensions. When experience and training of principals were considered, it was found that principals' scores in the Means-Ends Dimension were significantly related to length of experience in the principalship and to the amount of graduate work completed in educational administration.

Some of the variances reported in this study were of interest and indicated that there are wide variations within certain groups of principals in the perceptions which the members have of their role.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his appreciation for the assistance received during the preparation of this study. The guidance and encouragement given by Dr. E. Miklos is gratefully acknowledged.

Thanks are also extended to all principals and teachers who participated in the 1965 Climate Clinic and to the directors of this clinic for the data which were made available for this study.

Finally, the writer owes a special debt of gratitude to his wife whose encouragement and assistance contributed greatly to the completion of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. DEFINITION AND DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEM	1
The Problem	1
The Statement of the Problem	3
Sub-Problems	3
Assumptions	5
Delimitations	5
Limitations	5
Definition of Terms	6
Role	6
Perception	6
Role Perception	6
Dimensions of Role Perception	6
Organizational Climate	7
Dimensions of Organizational Climate	7
Organization of the Thesis	7
II. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RELATED RESEARCH	8
Theoretical Background	8
Role Theory	8
Social Behavior in Administration	10
Perception and Its Effect on Behavior	12
Some Dimensions of the Principal's Role Perception	16

CHAPTER		PAGE
The Status Dimension	17	
The Authority Dimension	17	
The Personal Dimension	18	
The Means-Ends Dimension	18	
Organizational Climate	19	
Related Research	29	
Research on Role Perception	29	
Research on Four Dimensions of Role Perceptions of Principals	33	
Research on Organizational Climate	37	
Hypotheses	41	
Hypotheses Regarding Role Perceptions as Independent Variables	41	
Hypotheses Regarding Role Perceptions as Dependent Variables	42	
III. INSTRUMENTATION AND METHODOLOGY	43	
Instrumentation	43	
The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire	43	
The Principal's Questionnaire	46	
Methodology	50	
The Samples	50	
Collection of Data	51	

CHAPTER	PAGE
Treatment of Data	52
IV. DESCRIPTIONS OF THE SAMPLES	56
The Principals	56
The Schools	62
Respondents to the OCDQ	65
Summary	70
V. ANALYSIS OF DATA	72
Hypotheses Regarding Role Perceptions as	
Independent Variables	72
Hypothesis Number One	72
Hypothesis Number Two	76
Hypothesis Number Three	85
Hypothesis Number Four	89
Hypothesis Number Five	91
Hypotheses Regarding Role Perceptions as	
Dependent Variables	94
Hypothesis Number Six	94
Hypothesis Number Seven	95
Hypothesis Number Eight	99
Hypothesis Number Nine	102
Hypothesis Number Ten	105
Hypothesis Number Eleven	107
Summary of Chapter V	109

CHAPTER	PAGE
VI. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	111
Summary and Conclusions Related to Organizational Climate	111
Summary and Conclusions Related to Teacher Ratings	114
Summary and Conclusions Related to Characteristics of Schools	116
Summary and Conclusions Related to Characteristics of Principals	119
Brief Discussion of the Study and Some Implications	122
BIBLIOGRAPHY	126
APPENDIX	131

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Intercorrelations of Scores in Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	49
II. Distribution of Climates by Types of Schools . . .	53
III. Intercorrelation of Organization Climate Scores . .	54
IV. Distribution of Principals by Sex	57
V. Distribution of Principals by Age	58
VI. Distribution of Principals by Years of Teacher Training	59
VII. Distribution of Principals by Amount of Graduate Work Done in Educational Administration	59
VIII. Distribution of Principals by Total Experience as Teacher and Principal	60
IX. Distribution of Principals by Experience as Principal	61
X. Distribution of Principals by Length of Tenure as Principal in Present School	62
XI. Distribution of Schools by Number of Teachers . . .	63
XII. Distribution of Schools by Grades Included	64
XIII. Distribution by Sex of the Respondents to the OCDQ And of the Alberta Teaching Force	66
XIV. Distribution by Age of the Respondents to the OCDQ.	67

TABLE	PAGE
XV. Distribution by Years of Training of the Respondents to the OCDQ	68
XVI. Distribution by Years of Teaching Experience of the Respondents to the OCDQ	69
XVII. Distribution by Length of Tenure in Present School of the Respondents to the OCDQ	70
XVIII. Distribution of Schools by Climate and Means For Each Dimension of the Principal's Role Perceptions	73
XIX. Analysis of Variance of Scores in the Status Dimension by Climates	74
XX. Analysis of Variance of Scores in the Authority Dimension by Climates	74
XXI. Analysis of Variance of Scores in the Personal Dimension by Climates	75
XXII. Analysis of Variance of Scores in the Means-Ends Dimension by Climates	75
XXIII. Relationships Between Scores in Dimensions of Principal Role Perception and Subtest Scores on the OCDQ	77
XXIV. Multiple Regression Prediction of School Scores in Disengagement by Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	81

TABLE		PAGE
XXV.	Multiple Regression Prediction of School Scores in Hindrance by Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	81
XXVI.	Multiple Regression Prediction of School Scores in Esprit by Dimensions of Principal Role Perception.	82
XXVII.	Multiple Regression Prediction of School Scores in Intimacy by Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	82
XXVIII.	Multiple Regression Prediction of School Scores in Aloofness by Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	83
XXIX.	Multiple Regression Prediction of School Scores in Production Emphasis by Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	83
XXX.	Multiple Regression Prediction of School Scores in Thrust by Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	84
XXXI.	Multiple Regression Prediction of School Scores in Consideration by Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	84
XXXII.	Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Between Dimensions of Principal Role Perception and Ratings of School Effectiveness	86

TABLE	PAGE
XXXIII. Tests of Significance of the Differences in Mean Ratings of School Effectiveness When Schools are Dichotomized on the Dimensions of Role Perception	87
XXXIV. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Between Dimensions of Principal Role Perception and Ratings of Teacher Satisfaction	90
XXXV. Tests of Significance of the Differences in Mean Ratings of Teacher Satisfaction When Schools are Dichotomized on the Dimensions of Role Perception	91
XXXVI. Pearson Product-Moment Correlations Between Dimensions of Principal Role Perception and Ratings of the Principals' Effectiveness	92
XXXVII. Tests of Significance of the Differences in Mean Ratings of Principals' Effectiveness When Schools are Dichotomized on the Dimensions of Role Perception	93
XXXVIII. Analysis of Variance on Scores of Principals in Four Dimensions of Role Perception by Size of School	95
XXXIX. Means of Role Perceptions by Type of School . . .	96

CHAPTER I

DEFINITION AND DISCUSSION OF THE PROBLEM

I. THE PROBLEM

This study was concerned with the perceptions which principals have of their role and the relationships of these perceptions to selected characteristics of schools and principals. A knowledge and understanding of these relationships may result in improved programs of preparation for the school administrator, more satisfactory selection and placement practices, and more effective in-service programs all of which should result in improved role performance.

Role theory has come to occupy an important place in the literature on educational administration in recent years, and the role of the principal has received much attention. The importance of the school principal in influencing the character and quality of a school is widely accepted. Numerous articles have appeared in the last few years on such subjects as the principal and program development, the principal and school discipline, the principal and staff morale, and the principal and the in-service program. And yet there is some speculation that in many schools the functions of the principalship are not being adequately discharged.

The increasing complexity of school organization will intensify the problems faced by school principals. Schools are

becoming larger, the student body more diverse in interest and ability, the teaching staff more professional and discriminating, and the demands of society more pressing and difficult to meet. To complicate the situation the changing values and orientations of society are resulting in conflicting expectations for the schools.

This increase in complexity of school organization has made it more difficult for role incumbents to have the necessary degree of understanding of their roles and of the total school organization. Role studies were given an important impetus by the model of social behavior developed by Getzels and Guba.¹ In addition, the more recent development by Halpin and Croft² of the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, herein after referred to at times as the OCDQ, promises to be very useful in understanding the total school organization. This instrument is concerned with the perceived interaction of the principal and of the staff as a whole and attempts to describe the "personality" of the school. The OCDQ forms an important part of this study. The climates of schools and the subtest scores obtained on the OCDQ are some of the characteristics of schools to be considered in this study.

¹Jacob W. Getzels and Egon C. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review, 65:423-41, Winter, 1957.

²Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1963).

Statement of the Problem

More specifically, this study examined the relationships between principals' perceptions of their role in four different dimensions and various characteristics of schools and of principals themselves. The role perceptions of principals were first taken as independent variables and their relationship to variables which may be considered as being dependent were examined. These dependent variables included characteristics of principals, interactions of teachers and principals, and characteristics of schools. The purpose of this part of the study was to determine whether the perceptions which a principal has of his role are related to various school characteristics. Causality may not be shown here, but establishment of a relationship would in itself be significant. A second major purpose of the study was to determine whether certain characteristics of the school and of the principal may affect the perceptions which the principal has of his role. For this purpose the role perceptions of principals were taken to be dependent variables and the characteristics of the school and principal were considered to be the independent variables. The concern here was to determine whether such characteristics as size of schools affect the perceptions which the principal has of his role.

Sub-Problems

The following sub-problems are derived from the major problems stated above and served as a guide for the development of the study.

1. What relationships, if any, exist between the principal's role perceptions and the organizational climate of the school?

2. What relationships, if any, exist between the principal's role perceptions and the school's scores on the subtests of the OCDQ?

3. Is there a relationship between the principal's role perceptions and rated school effectiveness?

4. Is there a relationship between the principal's role perceptions and teacher satisfaction?

5. Is there a relationship between the principal's role perceptions and the rated effectiveness of the principal?

6. Is there a relationship between the size of the school and the principal's role perceptions?

7. Is there a relationship between the grade range and level in the school and the principal's role perceptions?

8. Is there a relationship between the total teaching experience of the principal and his role perceptions?

9. Is there a relationship between the length of the principal's experience as a principal and his role perceptions?

10. Is there a relationship between the amount of training possessed by the principal and his role perceptions?

11. Is there a relationship between the amount of graduate work the principal has done in educational administration and his role perceptions?

II. ASSUMPTIONS

Basic to this study was the assumption that the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the Principal's Questionnaire gave valid and accurate measurements of the variables being studied.

III. DELIMITATIONS

This study includes only those schools which participated in the 1965 CSA Climate Clinic³ and whose principals completed and returned the Principal's Questionnaire. Another delimitation is that the measurement of role perception by the principal is limited to four dimensions, all related to his own behavior.

IV. LIMITATIONS

Limitations which may have a bearing on this study are:

1. All schools included in this study participated voluntarily in the CSA Organizational Climate Clinic.
2. The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire was developed in the United States and may include some questions which are not strictly pertinent to the Alberta school situation.
3. Lack of internal consistency in the Principal's Questionnaire and role perception scales and ambivalence in principals' responses to it may tend to distort the data.

³This clinic was sponsored jointly by the Department of Educational Administration of the University of Alberta and the Council on School Administration of the Alberta Teachers' Association. It was held in Edmonton on March 20, 1965, and in Calgary on March 27, 1965. Directors of the clinic were Dr. E. Miklos and Mr. F. Senger.

V. DEFINITION OF TERMS

Role is defined as a set of expectations applied to an incumbent of a particular position.

Perception is defined as a perceptual judgment; a judgment based upon an awareness of factors in the physical and social environment and influenced by the beliefs and attitudes of the individual.

Role Perception is defined as a sequence of behavior in which a perceptual judgment of role expectations is made. Operationally, it is defined as the total response of a principal to that part of a Principal's Questionnaire which was concerned with the four dimensions of role perceptions.

Dimensions of Role Perception are the following four dimensions as measured by the Principal's Questionnaire.

1. Status dimension refers to an emphasis on hierarchy versus an emphasis on equality in role perceptions.

2. Authority dimension refers to an emphasis on dependence versus an emphasis on independence in decision-making in role perceptions.

3. Personal dimension refers to the application of universalistic versus particularistic criteria in role perceptions.

4. Means-Ends dimension refers to an emphasis on process versus product in role perceptions.

Organizational Climate refers to the social interaction between the principal and the teachers as measured by the OCDQ and expressed in terms of one of the following climates: Open, Autonomous, Controlled, Familiar, Paternal, Closed.

Dimensions of Organizational Climate refers to the eight subtests of the OCDQ which are named as follows: Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, Intimacy, Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration.

VI. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

The problem has been introduced and defined in the present chapter; the remainder of this thesis is organized as follows. A theoretical background and a review of the related research is presented in the next chapter. This is followed, in Chapter III, by a description and discussion of the instruments used in this study and by an outline of the methodology employed. Chapter IV provides a complete description of the samples used, and Chapter V outlines the procedures used in the analysis of data, reports the results of the statistical treatments employed, and discusses the significance of these results. The thesis concludes, in Chapter VI, with a summary and interpretation of the findings of this study.

CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RELATED RESEARCH

This chapter presents a brief summary of the theoretical concepts and constructs which provide the background of understandings necessary for this study. It attempts to describe how administrative behavior originates and how perception influences this behavior. Some dimensions of principal's role perception are described. A survey of the literature on organizational climate is presented and an attempt is made to indicate how this concept can be useful in educational administration. This chapter also reviews the related research and attempts to relate the findings to the theoretical background presented. Finally, the null hypotheses which were tested in this study are stated.

The review of the related literature is divided into two parts. The first deals with the theoretical background while the second reviews the related research.

I. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Role Theory

Role theory explains the behavior of individuals in a social system in terms of the expectations held for the positions which are occupied by the individuals. Lonsdale states that an organization is a social system "made up of people who occupy various 'positions'

in vertical (hierarchical) and horizontal relationships to each other."¹ People in these positions behave, in part, according to the way they think they are expected to behave. A set of expectations applied to an incumbent of a particular position is called a role. A person enacting a role is usually aware or cognizant of the necessary role expectations which are acquired through experience. Sarbin states that "a role is a patterned sequence of learned actions or deeds performed by a person in an interaction situation,"² thus emphasizing the need for learning a role as well as indicating that role enactment occurs in social situations.

The nature of conflict within organizations is clarified by role theory. Role studies have indicated that role definers are seldom in complete agreement. Role conflict is aptly defined by Miklos when he says "the concept of role conflict refers to the observation that there is never complete agreement within and among the groups which may be considered to hold legitimate

¹ Richard C. Lonsdale, "Maintaining the Organization in Dynamic Equilibrium," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, pp. 142-177. The Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 149.

² T.R. Sarbin, "Role Theory," Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. I, Gardner Lindzey, editor. (Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1956), p. 225.

expectations for the incumbent of a particular position."³ Another possibility for role conflict exists; the incumbent of one role is certain to occupy other roles as well. A teacher may also be a mother, a wife, a church member, and conflict may arise between two or more roles performed by one person.

Social Behavior in Administration

The Getzels-Guba model of social behavior has proven to be extremely useful. Lipham says, "the theory of administration as a social process by Getzels continues to represent the most useful theory in the field of educational administration."⁴ This theory proposes that "the process of administration deals essentially with the conduct of social behavior in a hierarchical setting."⁵ Administration is conceived as consisting of a series of super-ordinate-subordinate relationships within a social system; this hierarchy of relationships serves as a locus for the allocation and integration of roles, personnel and facilities to achieve the goals of the system.⁶ The social system is composed of two classes of

³E. Miklos, "Role Theory in Administration," The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 3, Nov. 1963.

⁴James M. Lipham. "Organizational Character of Education: Administrative Behavior." Review of Educational Research. 34:435, October, 1964.

⁵J.W. Getzels and E.G. Guba. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process." The School Review, 65:423-41, Winter, 1957.

⁶Ibid., p. 424.

phenomena which, simultaneously, are conceptually independent and phenomenally interactive. One class of phenomena, labelled the nomothetic dimension, consists of the institutionization of certain roles and expectations which direct action toward attainment of the goals of the system. The other class of phenomena, called the idiographic dimension, recognizes that the social system is composed of individuals who have certain personalities and need-dispositions and whose interactions produce social behavior. The nomothetic dimension includes roles which are defined in terms of role expectations which set out for the incumbent--any incumbent--the functions to be filled. Some roles are carefully defined while others are not, but to some degree, incumbents of a given role will behave in a similar manner. The lack of complete congruency of behavior among role incumbents is due to the fact that roles are occupied by real individuals, and no two individuals are exactly alike. Each individual has specific and different need-dispositions which will cause him to act in his own characteristic way. Thus, the behavior of a given individual in a certain social situation will be determined by the perception he holds of the role he occupies in that situation and also by the type of person he is. To understand behavior we must be concerned with both the sociological and the psychological level of analysis.

Applying this theory to the school principalship, it will be

recognized that the behavior of any given principal is determined by the role he occupies, with the role expectations which he perceives, and by his own personality and need-dispositions. The role of the principal is not highly and exactly defined, as is, for example, a military rank, and it would be expected therefore that the principal's personality would play an important part in determining his behavior.

Perception and Its Effect on Behavior

The theory of social behavior discussed in the preceding section suggests that a key factor in an individual's behavior is his perception of the expectations held for an incumbent of that position. Morin states this idea succinctly when he says:

The behavior of an individual principal, therefore, will be predisposed by his own concept, or perception, of his role, based in part upon his perception of the expectations held for his position by reference groups, in part upon his perception of the formal, written requirements of his position, and in part upon his desire to gratify his own pattern of need-dispositions, which is at all times influencing his perceptions.⁷

There is wide agreement on the belief that perception of a situation influences behavior. Miklos states that "it is fairly evident that the behavior of an individual is influenced . . . by

⁷L.H. Morin, "Role Perception and Principals," The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 4, Feb. 1965.

his own perception of these expectations."⁸ Griffiths makes the point that the school administrator's perception of his environment is the key factor in his behavior.⁹ These perceptions influence the administrator's choice of problems to be solved, the ranking of these problems in order of priority, the making of decisions concerning alternative solutions, and any other processes by which the administrator seeks to achieve the goals of his organization. In further support of this position Ittleson and Cantril state that ". . . we act in terms of our perceptions."¹⁰

The common dictionary definition of perception as "awareness of objects; consciousness" is inadequate for an understanding of the role of perception in human behavior. Sarbin defines perception as "an intraorganismic response of the organism to stimulus objects and events."¹¹ In their definition of perception Ittleson and Cantril use a transactional approach.¹² In this approach, the three

⁸Miklos, loc. cit.

⁹Daniel E. Griffiths, "Perception: Its Relation to Administration." (New York: University Council on Educational Administration), p. 1. (Mimeographed.) cited in L.H. Morin, "The Principal's Perception of His Role," (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964), p. 24.

¹⁰William H. Ittleson and Hadley Cantril, Perception, A Transactional Approach. (Garden City: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1954), p. 7.

¹¹Sarbin, op. cit., p. 229.

¹²Ittleson and Cantril, op. cit., p. 14.

major characteristics of human perception are:

1. Perception can be studied only in terms of transactions, that is concrete individuals dealing with concrete situations.
2. Perception comes into the transaction from the unique personal behavioral center of the perceiver.
3. Perception occurs as the perceiver creates his own psychological environment by identifying certain aspects of his own experience to an environment which he believes exists independent of his own experience. This is called externalization.¹³

Interaction occurs between man and his environment. The concept of transaction refers to the content of this interaction, implying that the interaction results in change in the participants. By personal behavior is meant that a person entering a transaction is unique and different from all others in the transaction. The concept of externalization implies that "when we perceive anything, we consider it as external to ourselves."¹⁴ Because of the nature of perception no two people will see a situation in the same way. Every situation will be perceived differently by different individuals, and each individual will assume that what he perceives is real. Ittleson and Cantril summarize this as follows:

These three major characteristics of perception can be

¹³Daniel E. Griffiths, "Administration as Decision-Making," Administrative Theory in Education, Andrew W. Halpin, editor. (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958), p. 124, citing William H. Ittleson and Hadley Cantril, Perception (New York: Random House, 1954).

¹⁴Ibid., p. 125.

summarized by saying that perceiving is that part of the process of living by which each one of us, from his own particular point of view, creates for himself the world within which he has his life's experience and through which he strives to gain his satisfactions.¹⁵

These concepts of perception are useful in describing role perception. Sarbin's definition of perception leads easily to his definition of role perception as "an organized response of a person to stimuli in a social context."¹⁶ What is organized is the "contemporaneous event and the residua of the organism's prior experience."¹⁷ There are two influences, one external, the other internal. Another, and perhaps more useful, definition of role perception derives from the writings of Bartley¹⁸ and other writers¹⁹ who discussed the relationship between perception and judgment. Bartley summarizes this as follows:

The changing behavior . . . is not to be considered a single unit of activity . . . but rather a series of reactions each of which can be taken as a unit,

¹⁵ Ittleson and Cantril, op. cit., p. 5.

¹⁶ Sarbin, loc. cit.

¹⁷ Ibid.

¹⁸ S.H. Bartley, Principles of Perception (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958).

¹⁹ David Krech and Richard S. Crutchfield, Theory and Problems of Social Psychology (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948).

and called perceptual response When the observer comes to the terminal point, the reaction is called the expression of a judgment. Actually, the task given the observer was too exacting to be accomplished quickly by a single perceptual response. The observer spontaneously began the process of "judging." The report given by the observer is called a judgment²⁰

From this, role perception may be defined as a sequence of behavior in which a perceptual judgment is made and is then followed by role enactment in which the individual performs actions appropriate to the perceptual judgment made.

Some Dimensions of Principal's Role Perception

In addition to the role expectations which role incumbents hold for themselves, they are also aware of the expectations held for their roles by alter groups within and without the organization. A lack of congruence between the expectations of the role incumbents and of the alter groups results in role conflict. Seeman examined value conflicts in the culture for clues to possible dimensions of conflict in the expectations held for the behavior of those who hold positions of formal leadership.²¹ He suggests that if the culture is characterized by certain contradictory value emphases these may create special problems for administrators. This

²⁰ Bartley, op. cit., p. 23.

²¹ Melvin Seeman, Social Status and Leadership (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research and Service, 1960), pp. 4-11.

is a situationist approach to the study of leadership in that it focuses on the effects that interpersonal relationships within an organization have on leadership rather than on the personal qualities of the leader.

Observers of the American culture have pointed out a number of contradictory value emphases which probably also exist in other Western cultures. At least four bi-polarities can be isolated. The four dimensions which Seeman identified in the writings of Myrdal, Fromm, Stouffer, and Williams are the Status, the Authority, the Personal, and the Means-Ends Dimensions.

The Status Dimension. This involves the conflict between the success ideology and the equality ideology. These conflicting sets of beliefs are responsible for the worship of and striving for success on one hand and the emphasis on rank which accompanies success, and, on the other hand, for the denial of the significance of status that results from rank differentials. The contradictory values here often result in role conflict for leaders and subordinates.

The Authority Dimension. A second area of conflict occurs between the values of dependence and independence. On the one hand there appears to be a general passivity and dependence on leadership--a widespread refusal to accept responsibility. On the other hand there is a demand for participation and self-determination.

The Personal Dimension. The third area of conflict of special relevance for leadership involves the choice between universalistic and particularistic criteria for behavior. A universalistic obligation is applicable to dealings with anybody while a particularistic obligation is limited to persons who stand in some special relationship to one. For example, a school administrator faced with the problem of assigning duties to teachers may have to decide whether these duties will be assigned in an impersonal manner, regarding all teachers as completely equal, or whether consideration will be paid to age, experience, special talents, and personal preferences. Another excellent example of this bi-polarity exists in the relationships between teachers and pupils and between parents and pupils. The teacher tends to use universalistic criteria in her dealings with her pupils while the parents apply particularistic criteria in their dealings with the same pupils.

The Means-Ends Dimension. This dimension is concerned with the conflict between emphasis on getting the job done and emphasis on the process of achievement. It is in this area that the question of ends justifying means is often raised. Recognition of the conflicts in this dimension may be a cause of the recent emphasis on "group dynamics" which seems to be an attempt to find a balance between emphasis on group process and group product. Description of leadership behavior in terms of the two dimensions, initiating

structure and consideration, also appears to be closely related to the means-ends dimension. Initiating structure places emphasis on getting the job done, while consideration places emphasis on the process of achievement.

These are the four dimensions of role perception, or bi-polarities, with which this study is concerned. These possibilities for role conflict are deeply rooted in the culture and permeate the relationships in administration resulting in potential difficulties concerning role enactment.

Organizational Climate

Differences among organizations are readily observable even to casual observers and some differences have recently come under systematic study. The concept of personality has been very useful in the study of individuals; individuals develop fairly consistent patterns of behavior which are different from those of other individuals. Reference to an individual's personality is essentially a reference to his patterns of behavior. In like manner, organizations are characterized by distinctive patterns of operation. Though change occurs, as it also does in individuals, organizations tend to have a fair degree of stability. This condition of the organization is referred to by Miklos as "a steady or homeostatic state in which its internal processes and its relationship with its environment

maintain a fair degree of consistency."²² Argyris, among others, has recognized this, has referred to this state as the climate of the organization, and has given an explanation of why and how a specific climate may arise in an institution.²³ He says "... such variables as the 'right type,' 'hiring process,' 'passive leadership,' and 'formal policies,' may be adequate to account for the (assumed) process by which the present complexity called 'organizational climate' evolved."²⁴ Cornell, in discussing socially perceptive administration, used the term organizational climate and defined it as "... a delicate blending of interpretations by persons in the organization of their jobs or roles in relationship to others and their interpretations of the roles of others in the organization."²⁵ Others have referred to this homeostatic state as group atmosphere, group culture, and the syntality of a group.

The most recent extension of this concept has been developed

²² Erwin Miklos, "Organizational Climate and Program Development." Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1964. (Mimeo graphed) p. 3.

²³ Chris Argyris, "Some Problems in Conceptualizing Organizational Climate: A Case Study of a Bank." Administrative Science Quarterly, 2:501-520, March, 1958.

²⁴ Ibid., p. 517.

²⁵ Francis G. Cornell, "Socially Perceptive Administration." Phi Delta Kappan, 36:219-223, March, 1955.

by Halpin and Croft.²⁶ It deals specifically with educational administration and has provided concepts and categories for conceptualizing organizational climates of schools. In addition, the OCDQ developed by Halpin and Croft provides a means for quantifying measures of climate. The OCDQ as an instrument used in this study, is described in detail in Chapter III. A description of the eight subtests constituting the OCDQ and the six climate classifications developed by Halpin and Croft follows.

The first four subtests describe the behavior of the teachers, while the last four subtests describe the behavior of the principal. The subtests with some typical items describing behavior in each of the areas are as follows:²⁷

Disengagement. This subtest measures the extent to which teachers are really behaving as a group--the extent to which they work well together or gripe and bicker among themselves. Typical items are: (a) The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying, (b) Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings.

Hindrance. This subtest measures the extent to which teachers feel burdened with routine duties and other demands which they look

²⁶A.W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools. (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1963).

²⁷The substance of these definitions of the subtests was obtained from the mimeographed paper, "Organizational Climate: The Concept and the Instrument," by E. Miklos, Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1965.

upon as busy work. Typical items are: (a) Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching, (b) Student progress reports require too much time.

Esprit. This subtest measures the extent to which teachers' social needs and task-achievement needs are satisfied. This concept of esprit refers closely to what is usually termed "morale." Typical items in this subtest are: (a) The morale of teachers is high, (b) In faculty meetings there is a feeling of let's get things done.

Intimacy. This subtest measures the extent to which teachers enjoy friendly social relations with each other. Typical items are: (a) Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school, (b) Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members.

Aloofness. This subtest measures the degree to which the behavior of the principal is formal and impersonal. Typical items in this subtest are: (a) Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda, (b) The rules set by the principal are never questioned.

Production Emphasis. This subtest measures the extent to which the principal is directive and task oriented--how closely he supervises the staff. Typical items in this subtest are: (a) The principal makes all class scheduling decisions, (b) The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity.

Thrust. This subtest measures the degree to which the principal attempts to motivate teachers by the example which he personally sets. Typical items in this subtest are: (a) The principal goes out of his way to help teachers, (b) The principal sets an example by working hard himself.

Consideration. This subtest measures the extent to which the principal treats teachers with warmth--does extra things for them. Typical items in this subtest are: (a) The principal helps teachers solve personal problems, (b) The principal does personal favors for teachers.

The climates defined by Halpin and Croft are ranked according to their scores on Esprit, which the authors consider to be the best single indicator of "morale." It is also possible to distinguish among the six kinds of climates on the basis of three underlying variables identified in the subtests by factor analytic procedures.

These variables are:

1. Authenticity. The "authenticity," or "openness" of the leader's and the group members' behavior.
 2. Satisfaction. The group member's attainment of conjoint satisfaction in respect to task accomplishment and social needs.
 3. Leadership Initiation. The latitude within which the group members, as well as the leader, can initiate leadership acts.
- These variables are used in the following descriptions of

28 climates.

The Open Climate - describes an energetic and lively organization which is moving toward its goals at the same time as it provides satisfaction of group members' social needs. Leadership acts emerge easily and appropriately from both the group and the leader. There appears to be no great preoccupation with either task-achievement or social need satisfaction for these emerge easily and readily without undue emphasis or strain. The main characteristic of this climate is the authenticity or genuiness of behavior of all people in the organization.

The Autonomous Climate - refers to an organization in which leadership acts emerge primarily from the group and in which the leader exerts little control over group members. Satisfaction from social-needs satisfaction may be slightly higher than from task-achievement although the latter is also present. Authenticity of behavior is still high.

The Controlled Climate - is best characterized as highly impersonal and task-oriented. The group's behavior is directed primarily toward task-accomplishment and little emphasis is given to behavior directed at social-needs satisfaction. There is some lack of authenticity due to the disproportionate preoccupation with task achievement.

The Familiar Climate - is highly personal but undercontrolled. The members of the organization satisfy social needs but pay relatively little attention to task accomplishment. Whatever leadership acts emerge are likely to be from the staff and are not likely to be in connection with task achievement.

The Paternal Climate - describes a school in which the principal constrains the emergence of leadership acts from the group and attempts to initiate

²⁸ These descriptions are taken from the mimeographed paper, "Organizational Climate and Program Development," by Erwin Miklos, Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.

most of the acts himself. Leadership skills within the group are not used to supplement the principal's own ability to initiate leadership acts. Little satisfaction is gained from either social or achievement needs.

The Closed Climate - describes a situation in which there is a high degree of apathy on the part of all members of the organization. There is no social-needs or task achievement needs satisfaction. The behavior of members of the organization is inauthentic and the organization is stagnant.

Halpin and Croft made no attempt to define organizational climate other than to say by analogy that climate is to the organization what personality is to the individual.²⁹ However, they do limit their use of the term to refer exclusively to the social interaction between the principal and the teachers.³⁰ In referring to the OCDQ, Andrews concludes that "the instrument purports to measure certain aspects of teacher-principal relationships."³¹ Brown says that "organizational climate refers to the cathectic patterns giving identity to sub-group and interpersonal relations in a living organization."³² Miklos states this more clearly when he says that "the climate of an organization refers

²⁹ Halpin and Croft, op. cit., p. 1.

³⁰ Ibid., p. 7.

³¹ John H.M. Andrews. "Some Validity Studies of the OCDQ." A paper delivered at the conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, February 10, 1965. p. 4.

³² A. Brown, "Changing Climate." A paper read to the Council on School Administration Clinics on Organizational Climate, Edmonton, March 20, 1965 and Calgary, March 27, 1965. p. 4.

to the characteristics of certain social relationships which exist among the members of an organization and between the total organization and its participants."³³ Feldvebel supports this definition when he says "organizational climates may be defined as patterns of social interaction that characterize an organization. The main units of interaction in this concept of climates are individuals, the group as a group, and the leader."³⁴ Lonsdale takes a slightly different approach when he defines organizational climate as ". . . the global assessment of the interaction between the task-achievement dimension and the need-satisfaction dimension within the organization, or, in other words, of the extent of the task-needs integration."³⁵

The significance of climate to administration is obvious. First, the type of climate in a school is closely related to the morale of the staff. In fact, Andrews goes so far as to say that in many relationships the climate variable, as measured by the OCDQ, acts merely as a somewhat blurred Esprit score.³⁶ Others, including

³³ Erwin Miklos, "School Climate and Program Development." The Canadian Administrator, Vol. 4, April, 1965.

³⁴ Alexander M. Feldvebel, "Organizational Climate, Social Class, and Educational Output." Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 12, April, 1964.

³⁵ Lonsdale, op. cit., p. 166.

³⁶ Andrews, op. cit., p. 37.

Miklos³⁷ and Lonsdale,³⁸ have also noted the close relationship between morale and climate.

A second equally important reason for concern with climate is presented by Brown who believes that "it is not possible to talk organizational change without talking organizational climate."³⁹ Change must occur if an organization is to survive and to avoid stagnation; it is likely that the quality and rate of change will be determined to a large degree by the nature of the climate within the organization.

Two needs of an organization are to survive and to achieve its goals. Change at the proper rate and in the proper direction, will ensure the survival of the organization. The achievement of its goals, also, is dependent to a large extent on the climate within the organization. In a discussion of program development in schools Miklos⁴⁰ points out that adequate program development requires: (1) a minimum of conflict between the individual teacher and the school organization, (2) the release of the originality and

³⁷ Erwin Miklos, "Organizational Climate and Program Development," Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1964. (mimeographed) p. 3.

³⁸ Lonsdale, loc. cit.

³⁹ Brown, op. cit., p. 3.

⁴⁰ Miklos, op. cit., pp. 11-19.

the creative potential of all persons in the school, (3) effective group problem-solving, (4) tolerance for change and generally adaptive behavior on the part of the staff, and (5) appropriate and effective leadership. He hypothesizes that certain types of climates are more conducive than others to meeting these requirements.

To complete this discussion of climate, consideration must be given to some of the implications for school administration which are introduced by the concept of climate. The relationship between climate and the achievement of its goals by the organization has already been noted. Though not all factors which probably determine climate are controllable by school administrators, there is much that is subject to control. Physical environment and availability of resources are two factors most easily manipulated. Feldvebel suggests the possibility of controlling climate through the selection of teachers.⁴¹ Cornell suggests that a socially perceptive administrator, one who understands the behavior, attitudes, feelings and motivations of people, is necessary for the establishment of a satisfactory organizational environment, and also stresses the importance of how teachers feel toward the organization.⁴² In the same vein, Halpin and Croft imply that there is a need to provide training for administrators that will give them insight into the

⁴¹Feldvebel, loc. cit.

⁴²Cornell, loc. cit.

nature of different organizational climates through training in psychoanalysis and clinical psychology as well as in the social psychology of groups.⁴³

A fitting conclusion to this discussion of organizational climate comes from Feldvebel when he says:

It is also possible that administrators have been provided, in the OCDQ, with an evaluative criterion which goes beyond the more obvious, outward characteristics of schools and provides some guide to organizational improvement. It is believed analysis of the climates of educational systems is essential to the hope of providing a better basis for intelligent choices in education.⁴⁴

II. RELATED RESEARCH

This part of the chapter reviews briefly the related research and attempts to relate the findings to the theoretical background presented in the first part of the chapter. It deals, first, with some of the research on role perception. This is followed with some findings on the four dimensions of role perception by the principal, and a review of the research on organizational climate concludes this section of the chapter.

Research on Role Perception

There has been a great deal of research on perception, much

⁴³Halpin and Croft, op. cit., p. 113.

⁴⁴Feldvebel, loc. cit.

of it being beyond the scope of this study. Commenting on recent research in perception, Zalkind and Costello suggest that "a thread that would seem to tie many current findings together is the tendency of a person to use himself as the norm or standard by which he perceives or judges others"⁴⁵ and conclude that:

1. Knowing yourself makes it easier to see others accurately.
2. Our own characteristics affect the characteristics we are more likely to see in others.
3. The person who accepts himself is more likely to be able to see favorable aspects in others.
4. A corollary is the finding that for people we like, we tend to perceive more accurately the ways in which they are similar to us, and are less accurate in viewing the unlike ways.⁴⁶

Role perception, which is based on some general concepts of social perception, has also been quite extensively researched.

Merton Campbell, in examining the degree of self-role conflict existing among teachers and the relationships between such conflict and satisfaction, effectiveness, and confidence in leadership, found that teachers with a low degree of self-role conflict expressed greater satisfaction in teaching than did high-conflict teachers. They were also rated more effective by their principals and

⁴⁵Timothy W. Costello and S.S. Zalkind, Psychology in Administration: A Research Orientation (Toronto: Prentice-Hall of Canada, 1963), p. 45.

⁴⁶Ibid.

expressed greater confidence in the leadership of their principal.

In the study between self and perceived role, the low-conflict teachers received higher ratings on each of satisfaction, effectiveness, and confidence in the principal.⁴⁷

In a study of the principal's leadership role, Moyer found teacher satisfaction was related to correspondence within a group of attitudes and needs toward leadership, to correspondence among members of the group in group-centered attitudes toward leadership, and to the extent to which a principal encourages teachers to be less dependent on him and more interdependent on each other.⁴⁸ These findings emphasize the importance of congruence of perception on the part of teachers and principals if high teacher satisfaction is to be achieved.

In a study of the perceptions held by superintendents of schools and consultants from departments of education for each other's role, Ferneau found that consultants and administrators

⁴⁷ Roald F. Campbell, John E. Corbally, and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration, Second edition (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1963), p. 190, citing Merton V. Campbell, "Self-Role Conflict Among Teachers and Its Relationship to Satisfaction, Effectiveness, and Confidence in Leadership" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1958).

⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 192, citing Donald C. Moyer, "Teachers Attitudes Toward Leadership As They Relate to Teacher Satisfaction" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1954).

must perceive each other as functioning in the expected manner if the consultation is to be considered effective. Expectations had a greater effect on rating of effectiveness than the consultative service itself.⁴⁹

Fast, after a study on the relationship of leader behavior of principals to teacher satisfaction, concluded that congruence of expectations and perceptions of leader behavior is strongly related to teacher satisfaction, and that perceptions of leader behavior are related to teacher satisfaction.⁵⁰

Among many other studies in this area are those of Chesler, Schmuck and Lippett,⁵¹ Thorin⁵² and Jensen.⁵³ Chesler, Schmuck and

⁴⁹ Elmer F. Ferneau, "Which Consultant?" Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 2, April, 1954.

⁵⁰ R.G. Fast, "Leader Behavior of Principals As It Relates to Teacher Satisfaction" (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964).

⁵¹ Lipham, op. cit., p. 448, citing Mark Chesler, Richard Schmuck, and Ronald Lippett, "The Principal's Role in Facilitating Innovation," Theory into Practice, 2:269-77; Dec. 1963.

⁵² Frederick D. Thorin, "A Study to Determine the Accuracy With Which Selected Secondary School Principals Perceive the Role Expectations Held For Them by Their Staff and Superintendent" (Doctor's thesis. Detroit: Wayne State University, 1961), pp. 165. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts 22:480-81; No. 2, 1961.

⁵³ Leland Edward Jensen, "Teachers' Professional Responsibilities: An Interpersonal Perception Study." (Doctor's thesis. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1963), pp. 146. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts 24:2336; No. 6, 1963.

Lippett found that the degree of the principal's accuracy in perceiving the expectations and interests of his teachers was positively related to the staff's tendency to change, thus suggesting that a principal's role perception is a factor in innovation. Thorin found that school principals do not accurately perceive the role expectations held for them by their teachers and superintendents. Jensen concluded that principals are relatively unsuccessful in communicating their expectations to their teachers. The Thorin and Jensen studies both indicate the difficulties which exist in the area of role perceptions.

The research on role perception indicates that accurate role perceptions are vital. Inaccurate perception can result in behavior which fails in task achievement and causes antagonism among important and influential alter groups. Consequently, the school administrator should be aware of the intricacies of the perceptual process.

Research on Four Dimensions of Role Perceptions of Principals

The four dimensions of role perceptions of principals being considered here are the Status, Authority, Personal and Means-Ends Dimensions which are derived from the work of Seeman.⁵⁴ The quantity of research involving these dimensions is rather limited.

In a study involving twenty six communities, Seeman examined

⁵⁴Seeman, loc. cit.

the leadership of superintendents, secondary-school principals and elementary-school principals. Information was obtained from over one thousand teachers and from seventy-seven school leaders. This study was concerned principally with the question of status. Some of the conclusions drawn from this study are:

1. Teachers who rate the leader high in community status and who see a great difference in status between themselves and the leader generally evaluate him highly as an organizational leader.
2. Leaders who rate themselves high in status and who see great status differences between themselves and their teachers are evaluated highly by subordinates.
3. High self-ratings in community status by leaders together with low ratings by subordinates are associated with low evaluation by subordinates.
4. Leaders who underrate the teachers' status are accorded low evaluation by their subordinates.
5. Teachers working under leaders who emphasize status differences between themselves and the teachers assign lower evaluation scores.
6. Extra-organizational status ratings are relevant for the judgment of leadership quality within the organization.⁵⁵

Another study of even greater interest here since it deals

⁵⁵Seeman, op. cit., p. 92.

with all four dimensions of the principal's role was carried out by Miklos.⁵⁶ A questionnaire, similar to the Principal's Questionnaire used in this study, was completed by 765 teachers in sixty-two non-city schools in Alberta. These were scored and seven quasi scales were derived, quasi scale being defined in accord with Gutman's scale techniques. Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were calculated to give a correlation matrix for the quasi scale scores. The relationships suggested that there may be a tendency on the part of some teachers to hold expectations for the behavior of principals characterized by inclinations toward universalism, independence, equality, and means, while others have a tendency to hold expectations which favor particularism, dependence, hierarchy, and ends. Examination of the expectations of teachers for the behavior of principals indicated that older teachers preferred universalistic behavior by the principals on social matters and in the assignment of school duties to a greater extent than did the younger teachers. Older teachers also considered it more appropriate for principals to emphasize their higher position in the organization than did younger teachers who were more evenly divided on the question. There was also a greater acceptance of principal behavior which emphasized ends on the part of male teachers, teachers of higher training, and teachers in the higher grades.

⁵⁶Erwin Miklos, "Dimensions of Conflicting Expectations and the Leader Behavior of Principals" (Unpublished Doctoral thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1963).

Principal expectations for their own behavior were not always the same as the teacher expectations. The younger and less experienced principals held self-expectations which tended toward universalism to a greater extent than did the older and more experienced principals. In the assignment of duties the younger principals tended more toward particularism. However, the older principal leaned in the direction of universalism in the assignment of duties, as did the older teachers. In the matter of dependence-independence, it was found that the more highly trained principals encouraged independence of teachers. No significant relationships between school size and expectations held for the behavior of the principal were found. A comparison of the responses of teachers and the responses of principals showed that principals favored universalism in their self-expectations concerning the assignment of duties to teachers to a greater extent than did teachers, and also favored greater emphasis on means or on the form of behavior.

Another study which has relevance is the one by Moyer mentioned earlier. Reporting in the Administrator's Notebook he presents the hypothesis, which he recognizes requires more testing, that "the extent to which a principal reveals himself to be one who encourages teachers to be less dependent on him and more interdependent on each other, the higher the teacher satisfaction in the group."⁵⁷

⁵⁷ D.C. Moyer, "Leadership That Teachers Want," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 3, March, 1955.

Working in a somewhat different area, Congreve reached the conclusion that "staff members tended to prefer the formal, impersonal approach to administration,"⁵⁸ believing it to be more consistent, more positive in approach, and more satisfying of their basic professional needs.

A more recent study by Von Brock resulted in the conclusion that the four dimensions of principal's role perception used in the present study were useful in describing the roles of principals and superintendents.⁵⁹ Significant differences were found between superintendents and principals for both roles regarding each dimension except the institutional. (The institutional dimension is concerned with institutional obligations versus personal obligations, and is similar to the personal dimension used in this study.) In addition, differences in expectations for both administrative roles were found to be systematically related to differences in size of school district.

Research on Organizational Climate

One of the earlier studies on organizational climates was

⁵⁸ W.J. Congreve, "Administrative Behavior and Staff Relations," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 6, October, 1957.

⁵⁹ Lipham, op. cit., p. 439, citing Robert Carl Von Brock, "A Study of Role Perceptions of Superintendents and Principals in the State of Illinois," Doctor's thesis. (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University, 1962), Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts 23:3749-50; No. 10, 1963.

carried out by Mathews.⁶⁰ Nine hospitals were studied on five dimensions of administrative climate on a continuum ranging from a social philosophy of administration to a technological philosophy of administration. A significant correlation was found between the tenure of nurses and the degree of philosophic contradiction. The more consistent the administrative climate, regardless of whether it was of a social or technological orientation, the longer the tenure of nurses. Hospitals showing philosophic contradictions had shorter tenure among their nurses.

After the development of the OCDQ several studies were made in the educational field using this instrument. One of the first studies was done by Feldvебel.⁶¹ His study was designed to explore the possibilities that organizational climate in schools was a function of the socio-economic status of the school community and that output of the school was a function of organizational climate as well as of the socio-economic status of the community. There was no tendency for climate to be associated with the social class of a community or

⁶⁰ B. Phelps Mathews, "Inconsistency: A Complex Problem in Administration," Hospital Administration, 7(Fall, 1962), pp. 21-35, cited in Richard C. Lonsdale, "Maintaining the Organization in Dynamic Equilibrium," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, pp. 142-177. The Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1964).

⁶¹ Feldvебel, loc. cit.

with the output of the school. However, some subtests of the OCDQ were significantly related to social class and school output. Hindrance and Consideration were associated with the social class of the community; Production Emphasis and Consideration were associated with pupil achievement, the first negatively, and the second positively.

Another, more recent study by Anderson investigated relationships between the organizational climate of elementary schools and selected personal variables of the schools' principals. It was found that some attributes of leader personality appear to be associated with leader behavior as reflected in the organizational climates. Principals in the more open climates were more confident, self-secure, self-confident, cheerful and resourceful than principals in more closed climates. Dimensions such as the principal's age, sex, marital status, education background, number of years of experience, and the number of teachers in the schools were found to be independent of the openness of the school's climates. It was also found that principals as a group perceive the organizational climate of their schools more favorably than do their staff members.⁶²

A group of studies involving the OCDQ have been carried out

⁶²Donald Anderson, "Relationships Between Organizational Climates of Elementary Schools and Personal Variables of the Principals." A paper delivered at the conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, February 10, 1965.

at the University of Alberta. Schmidt⁶³ examined the relationship between OCDQ subtest scores and LBDQ subtest scores and found that the number of meaningful relationships between the two instruments is reassuring with respect to both. Another study by Plaxton⁶⁴ investigated relationships between the personality of the principal as measured by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator⁶⁵ and the OCDQ. No overall relationships between the principal's personality type and climate were found. However, there were some significant relationships between personality type and OCDQ subtest scores. Andrews reports a strong positive relationship between teacher satisfaction and climate; he also found that the rated principal effectiveness is so highly correlated with scores on the subtest Thrust that the two measures are virtually interchangeable. Teacher's ratings of school's effectiveness are correlated positively with Esprit and climate, and negatively with Disengagement. In the same study Andrews found no significant relationship between climate and school achievement. Examination of the relationships between OCDQ subtest

⁶³ Werner G. Schmidt, "Relationships Between Certain Aspects of Leader Behavior and Organizational Climate" (Master's thesis in preparation, University of Alberta, Edmonton).

⁶⁴ Robert P. Plaxton, "Relationships Between Principal's Personality and the Organizational Climate of Their Schools" (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1965).

⁶⁵ Isobel Briggs Myers, Manual: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1963).

scores and school achievement led him to conclude that Thrust and Production Emphasis have little effect on school achievement; a high relationship with Intimacy made it appear that teachers are motivated more by the group than by the leader.⁶⁶

III. HYPOTHESES

The preceding review of the related research gives much of the background for the present study. The fundamental purpose of this study was to determine, first, if principals' perceptions of their role were related to certain descriptions of their schools, and, second, if certain independent variables within the schools and within principals themselves were related to the principals' role perceptions. The sub-problems, as listed in Chapter I, focused on specific relationships to be investigated. These sub-problems are restated here as null hypotheses.

Hypotheses Regarding Role Perceptions as Independent Variables

1. There are no significant relationships between the principal's role perceptions and the climate classification of his school.

2. There are no significant relationships between the principal's role perceptions and the school's scores on the sub-tests of the OCDQ.

⁶⁶ Andrews, op. cit. pp. 25-34.

3. There are no significant relationships between the mean rating of a school's effectiveness given by teachers and the principal's role perceptions.

4. There are no significant relationships between the mean rating of teacher satisfaction and the principal's role perceptions.

5. There are no significant relationships between the mean rating by the teachers of their principal's effectiveness and the principal's role perceptions.

Hypotheses Regarding Role Perceptions as Dependent Variables

6. There are no significant relationships between school size and the principal's role perceptions.

7. There are no significant relationships between the type of school and the principal's role perceptions.

8. There are no significant relationships between total teaching experience of the principal and his role perceptions.

9. There are no significant relationships between the length of the principal's experience as a principal and his role perceptions.

10. There are no significant relationships between the amount of training possessed by the principal and his role perceptions.

11. There are no significant relationships between the amount of graduate work the principal has done in educational administration and his role perceptions.

CHAPTER III

INSTRUMENTATION AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter includes a description and discussion of the instruments used in the collection of data and an outline of the methodology employed in this study.

I. INSTRUMENTATION

Two instruments were used in obtaining the data necessary for this study. These were the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire and the Principal's Questionnaire. A copy of each questionnaire is included in the Appendix.

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire

The OCDQ was developed by Halpin and Croft; its development and structure are fully described in a recent monograph.¹ The purpose of this instrument is to measure and portray the Organizational Climate of an elementary school.

The OCDQ consists of sixty-four Likert-type items which have been assigned to eight subtests which were delineated by factor-analytic methods. Four of these subtests--Disengagement, Hindrance, Esprit, and Intimacy--describe characteristics of the group of

¹A.W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1963). Except where otherwise noted, the description which follows is based on the information in this monograph.

teachers in the school. The other four subtests--Aloofness, Production Emphasis, Thrust, and Consideration--describe the behavior of the principal. The areas measured by each of these subtests have been described and examples of typical items included have been given in Chapter II. To compute each respondent's eight subtest scores, the item scores are summed, subtest by subtest, and then each of the eight sums is divided by the corresponding number of items in the subtest. The mean and standard deviation for each subtest (summing across all respondents) is then computed and these raw scores are converted into standard scores with a mean of fifty and a standard deviation of ten. To obtain subtest scores for a school the mean score of the respondents in that school on each subtest is calculated.

Using the subtest scores for a school, a profile whose components are the eight subtest scores is constructed. A profile-similarity score is then computed which allows numerical determination of the extent to which the school profile approximates the prototypic profiles which characterize each of the six climates. The profile-similarity score is obtained by computing the sum of the absolute differences between the school's profile and the six prototypic profiles. A low sum indicates that the two profiles are highly similar, whereas a large sum indicates that the profiles are dissimilar. The climate classification for the school is determined by finding the lowest profile-similarity score and assigning to the school the

climate whose prototypic profile produced this low score.

Halpin and Croft made no attempt to determine the validity and reliability of the OCDQ. They recognized fully the limitations of their study and state these clearly. They recognized that there are numerous factors which could be conceived as defining the Climate of a school and chose to limit their study to descriptions made of the school primarily in terms of teacher-principal relationships because a start had to be made somewhere and this area of social interaction appeared to be promising. The spirit of this research was heuristic and the result was a tentative way of describing the Organizational Climate of schools.

In a recent paper Andrews focused on some validity studies of the OCDQ and from an assessment of the evidence gathered in several studies involving the OCDQ concluded that "the overall Climate categorizations may be considered as reasonably valid descriptions of commonly occurring patterns of certain aspects of principal-staff interaction."² In regard to the subtests of the OCDQ, he concluded that "the subtests . . . provide reasonably valid measures of important aspects of the leadership of the school principal

²John H.M. Andrews, "Some Validity Studies of the OCDQ." A paper delivered at the conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, February 10, 1965, p. 37.

in a perspective of interaction with his staff."³

Although the OCDQ was developed in a study which involved only elementary schools, there is evidence to indicate that it is valid for other types of schools. Andrews cites three kinds of evidence to this effect and concludes that "the OCDQ appears to be as valid for other kinds of schools as it is for elementary schools."⁴ On the basis of this evidence the use of the OCDQ in this study would appear to be justified.

In addition to the sixty-four questions constituting the eight subtests, the printed form of the OCDQ used in this study included an appended questionnaire consisting of eleven questions which were designed to provide information concerning the size and types of schools taking part in the study, biographical information for teachers and principals, and ratings of teacher satisfaction, of school effectiveness, and of principal effectiveness.

The Principal's Questionnaire

The Principal's Questionnaire was prepared for use in the 1965 CSA Clinic on Organizational Climate.⁵ It is based, in part,

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Footnoted previously. See page 5.

on material and ideas found in studies by Miklos⁶ and Seeman.⁷

Principal's responses to parts A, B, and C of this questionnaire were used in this study. Part A described school characteristics including size and grade range. Part B described administrative characteristics including such items as sex, age, training and experience of the principal. Part C measured reactions of principals to statements concerned with the four dimensions of role perception involved in this study.

Statements fourteen to twenty-three measured the principal's perceptions in the Status Dimension. Examples of statements in this section include: (a) A principal should think of himself as being one of the teachers in the school, (b) A principal should be more like a superintendent than like a teacher. Statements twenty-six to thirty-five measured the principal's perceptions in the Authority Dimension. Examples of statements in this section include: (a) A principal should visit regularly the classes of those teachers who are weak in discipline in an attempt to keep the classes under control, (b) A principal should allow teachers to work out their

⁶Erwin Miklos, "Dimensions of Conflicting Expectations and the Leader Behavior of Principals." Unpublished Doctoral thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1963.

⁷Melvin Seeman, Social Status and Leadership (Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research and Service, 1960).

classroom problems by themselves. The principal's perceptions in the Personal Dimension were measured by statements thirty-eight to forty-seven. Examples of statements in this section include: (a) A principal should not visit the homes of some teachers any more often than he visits the homes of others, (b) A principal should take into account such personal obligations of teachers as family responsibilities when assigning extra-curricular duties. Statements fifty to fifty-nine measured the principal's perceptions in the Means-Ends Dimension. Examples of statements in this section include: (a) A principal should recognize that there is greater value in operating a school democratically than in doing some tasks more quickly by less democratic means, (b) A principal should not hesitate to depart from official procedures if it means that certain tasks will be carried out more effectively.

The statements in the role perception part of the Principal's Questionnaire each had five possible responses ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." These responses were weighted from one to five. Because one-half of the statements emphasized one extreme of behavior while the other half emphasized an opposite extreme of behavior the response "strongly agree" was in some cases weighted one and other cases weighted five. The third or middle response, "uncertain," was always weighted three. Thus in any given dimension a principal's raw score could range from ten to fifty.

The scoring of the Principal's Questionnaire was arranged so that a high score in the Status Dimension indicated an emphasis on differences in status, a high score in the Authority Dimension indicated the encouragement of the independence of teachers, a high score in the Personal Dimension indicated an emphasis on universalism, and a high score in the Means-Ends Dimension indicated an emphasis on means.

An intercorrelation of scores in dimensions of principal's role perception was calculated. The results are shown in Table I. Relationships significant at the .05 level are found between the

TABLE I
INTERCORRELATIONS OF SCORES IN DIMENSIONS
OF PRINCIPAL ROLE PERCEPTION

Dimensions	Authority Dimension	Personal Dimension	Means-Ends Dimension
Status Dimension	-0.051 ^a	<u>0.167</u> ^b	<u>-0.183</u>
Authority Dimension		0.020	0.117
Personal Dimension			-0.045

^aAll coefficients are Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients.

^bUnderlined coefficients are significant at the .05 level.

Status Dimension and the Personal Dimension and between the Status

Dimension and the Means-Ends Dimension. The intercorrelations, as a whole, however, indicate that the dimensions tend to be independent of each other with the exception of the Status Dimension.

The four sets of statements used in Part C of the Principal's Questionnaire were judged to be useful and appropriate for this study because of the manner in which they were developed. In a study which explored the utility of Guttman scale analysis procedures for quantifying and for analyzing the structure of the expectations which teachers hold for the behavior of principals, Miklos identified seven sets of items describing behavior of principals, as quasi scales.⁸ The sets of items were based on the same four dimensions of principal's role perception as is this study. The four sets of statements used in Part C of the Principal's Questionnaire are extensions of these quasi scales. Thus, though the reliability of these scales was not determined specifically for this study, the sets of statements were judged to be valid and reliable for the purpose for which they were used.

II. METHODOLOGY

The Samples

There were 185 schools, 183 principals, and 1702 teachers in the samples used in this study; participation by principals was

⁸Miklos, op. cit.

entirely voluntary. Involvement of a principal automatically required the participation of all or part of his staff. It is unknown to what extent the participation of teachers was voluntary. The participating schools were located in all parts of Alberta and included elementary schools, junior high schools, senior high schools and various combinations of these types of schools. A complete description of the samples is found in Chapter IV.

Collection of Data

All data used in this study were collected in conjunction with the 1965 CSA Clinic on Organizational Climate mentioned earlier. This clinic was advertised to Alberta school principals by the Council on School Administration of the Alberta Teachers' Association. After the registration of the principal a package containing ten copies of the OCDQ, one copy of the Principal's Questionnaire, and the necessary instructions was sent to him.* The principal was required to remove from the package and complete one OCDQ and the Principal's Questionnaire. He was then to choose a responsible member of his staff to act as a coordinator and to turn over to him the remaining OCDQ's. The coordinator plus eight other teachers chosen at random by him completed the remaining copies of the OCDQ. In schools where there were ten or fewer staff members everyone participated. Upon completing the OCDQ, the respondent

*Copies of these instructions are found in the Appendix.

placed it in an envelope which was then sealed; only the name of the school was written on the envelope. In this manner, anonymity of responses was assured. There was no consultation among teachers before or during the completion of the questionnaire, and teachers were given as much time as required for this purpose. The coordinator then collected all the sealed envelopes, including one from the principal, and mailed them to the director of the climate clinic.

Treatment of Data

On receipt of the questionnaires, a code number was assigned to each school, and this number was placed on all OCDQ's and the Principal's Questionnaire from that school. The OCDQ's were further coded to indicate teachers within the school. For example, a given OCDQ could be identified as coming from teacher number seven from school number fifty-six. Though the school could be identified by its code number the teacher could not. After coding, section C of the Principal's Questionnaire was scored by use of a key and the sums of scores within each of the four subsections of this section were determined. These sums were written in the numbered blanks provided on the questionnaire for this purpose. After this initial treatment the data on both sets of questionnaires were transferred to IBM punch cards. Most of the subsequent statistical treatments to which these data were subjected were carried out by an IBM electronic computer.

The first treatment of the data, completed before the climate

clinics were held, produced OCDQ Subtest scores and organizational climate classifications for all schools in the samples. Table II shows the distribution of climates by schools. A total of forty-three schools or 23.2 per cent of the sample had an Open climate. The Autonomous climate was found in twenty-three schools or 12.4 per cent of the sample, the Controlled climate in thirty-six schools or 19.4 per cent of the sample, the Familiar climate in thirteen schools or 7.0 per cent of the sample, the Paternal climate in nineteen schools or 10.4 per cent of the sample, and the Closed climate in fifty-one schools or 27.5 per cent of the sample. This approximates

TABLE II
DISTRIBUTION OF CLIMATES BY TYPES OF SCHOOLS

Type of School	Kind of Climate				
	Open	Autonomous	Controlled	Familiar	Paternal
					Closed
Grs. 1 - 6	23	7	15	4	2
Grs. 1 - 8	1	2	6	1	3
Grs. 1 - 9	3	7	5	4	3
Grs. 1 - 11	0	0	1	1	0
Grs. 1 - 12	4	4	3	1	3
Grs. 1 - 12	4	4	3	1	3
Grs. 7 - 9	6	1	1	1	2
Grs. 7 - 12	2	0	2	1	1
Grs. 9 - 12	0	0	2	0	1
Grs. 10 - 12	4	2	1	0	4
Totals	43	23	36	13	19
					51

rather closely the distribution found in the Halpin study where out of a sample of seventy-one schools, seventeen schools or 23.8 per cent had an Open climate, ten schools or 14.0 per cent had an Autonomous climate, twelve schools or 16.8 per cent had a Controlled climate, six schools or 8.4 per cent had a Familiar climate, twelve schools or 16.8 per cent had a Paternal climate, and fifteen schools or 21.0 per cent had a Closed climate.

Intercorrelations were calculated on the OCDQ Subtest scores and are reported in Table III. The magnitude and direction of the significant relationships were compared with those reported by Andrews in a similar study⁹ and with those found by Halpin and Croft

TABLE III
INTERCORRELATION OF ORGANIZATIONAL
CLIMATE SCORES
(N = 183 schools)

Sub-Test	Hin	Esp	Int	Al	PE	Th	Con
Disengagement	<u>.480</u>	<u>-.537</u>	.064	.123	.110	<u>-.431</u>	-.054
Hindrance		<u>-.394</u>	-.099	.124	.060	<u>-.377</u>	-.228
Esprit			<u>.203</u>	-.169	.167	<u>.647</u>	<u>.339</u>
Intimacy				-.039	.068	<u>.240</u>	<u>.366</u>
Aloofness					.068	<u>-.105</u>	-.033
Prod. Emphasis						.121	.145
Thrust							<u>.589</u>

^aUnderlined Pearson Product-Moment Correlations are significant at the .01 level.

⁹Andrews, op. cit.

in their original work on organizational climate.¹⁰ Of the twenty-eight correlation coefficients reported in each of the three sets of intercorrelations there is complete agreement in direction of relationship in twenty-seven of them. In addition, of the twelve significant relationships reported in Table III, eleven were reported to be significant at the same level in the Andrews study. On the basis of these comparisons it may be said that results of the climate clinic were very similar to those found in similar studies by Halpin and Croft and by Andrews.

The statistical treatments employed specifically for this study consisted, first, of the standardization of the raw scores in the four dimensions of the principal's role perceptions to a mean of fifty and a standard deviation of ten. Then, with the use of appropriate computer programs the data were subjected to analyses of variance, Pearson product-moment correlations, multiple correlation, and "t" tests. Specific statistical treatments applied in the testing of each hypothesis will be outlined in Chapter V.

¹⁰Halpin and Croft, op. cit.

CHAPTER IV

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLES

Previous chapters have contained definitions and discussions of the problem, reviews of the literature, and descriptions of the instruments and methods used in this study. This chapter gives a more complete description of the sample of principals used, and of the schools which they administer. It will also describe briefly the teachers who participated in this study by completing the OCDQ from which were obtained the school climates, the climate subtest scores and the ratings on the schools' effectiveness, the satisfaction of teachers and the effectiveness of the principals. The data presented in this chapter were obtained from the first twelve items of the Principal's Questionnaire and from items sixty-five to seventy-five of the OCDQ.

There are, essentially, three samples involved in this study. First, there is a sample of 183 principals who responded to the Principal's Questionnaire. Second, there are 185 schools varying in size and other characteristics. Finally, there are 1702 teacher and principal respondents to the OCDQ.

I. THE PRINCIPALS

Although 185 schools participated in this study, only 183 different principals were involved. In two cases one person served

as the principal for two different schools. In this description of the sample of principals reference is made to 183 principals.

Table IV shows the distribution by sex of the principals who responded to the Principal's Questionnaire. As would be expected male principals constitute a majority, making up 92.31 per cent of the sample. In his description of a similar sample Plaxton¹ found that 90.2 per cent of the principals were male.

TABLE IV
DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS BY SEX

Sex	No. of Principals	Per Cent
Male	168	92.31
Female	14	7.69
Total	182 ^a	100.00

^aOne principal did not respond to this item.

The distributions by age of the principals is shown in Table V. Only one principal was under twenty-four years old. The category including principals thirty-five to thirty-nine years contained the largest proportion of principals representing 17.03

¹Robert P. Plaxton, "Relationships Between Principals' Personality and the Organization Climates of Their Schools" (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1965), p. 47.

per cent of the sample. However, all five year ranges from ages twenty-five years to fifty-nine years were well represented. Only 5.49 per cent of the principals were sixty years or over in age.

TABLE V
DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS BY AGE

Age	No. of Principals	Per Cent
Under 24 years	1	.55
25 to 29 years	18	9.89
30 to 34 years	20	10.99
35 to 39 years	31	17.03
40 to 44 years	29	15.93
45 to 49 years	28	15.38
50 to 54 years	22	12.09
55 to 59 years	23	12.64
60 years or over	10	5.49
Total	182 ^a	99.99

^aOne principal did not respond to this item.

On the whole the principals in this sample possess a fair degree of preparation with only twenty-one principals, or 11.60 per cent, having less than four years of teacher training. More than one-half of the principals have more than four years of teacher training and almost one-third of them possess six years of teacher training. Complete data are shown in Table VI.

TABLE VI
DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS BY YEARS OF TEACHER TRAINING

Years of Training	No. of Principals	Per Cent
One year	4	2.21
Two years	7	3.87
Three years	10	5.52
Four years	61	33.70
Five years	44	24.31
Six years	55	30.39
Total	181 ^a	100.00

^aTwo principals did not respond to this item.

Despite the fact that more than one-half of the principals have more teacher training than what is generally considered equivalent to one degree, the data indicate that fewer than one-half of the principals have completed some courses in educational administration. Table VII shows that one-half of the principals have no

TABLE VII
DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS BY AMOUNT OF GRADUATE WORK DONE IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Amount of Graduate Work	No. of Principals	Per Cent
No graduate university courses in administration	92	51.11
Some courses in administration	73	40.56
Hold a graduate degree in educational administration	15	8.33
Total	180 ^a	100.00

^aThree principals did not respond to this item.

graduate university courses in administration and only 8.33 per cent of them hold a graduate degree in educational administration.

Table VIII shows the distribution by total experience as teacher and principal of the principals in this sample. Only six respondents had fewer than five years of experience in the field of education. This is not unusual as few principals are appointed who do not have a fairly wide background of experience as a teacher. The mode in this distribution is the category embracing thirteen to sixteen years of experience as teacher and principal. Slightly over one-sixth of the sample had thirty-two or more years of experience as teacher and principal.

TABLE VIII
DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS BY TOTAL EXPERIENCE AS TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL

Length of Experience as Teacher and Principal	No. of Principals	Per Cent
4 years or less	6	3.33
5 to 8 years	21	11.67
9 to 12 years	22	12.22
13 to 16 years	40	22.22
17 to 20 years	23	17.78
21 to 23 years	14	7.78
24 to 27 years	8	4.44
28 to 31 years	14	7.78
32 years or more	32	17.78
Total	180 ^a	100.00

^aThree principals did not respond to this item.

Examination of the data in Table IX shows that more than one-half of the principals have less than ten years of experience as principals. This is to be expected since the trend toward centralization of rural schools in Alberta did not begin until quite recently. One-eighth of the principals were in their first year of experience as principals while one-tenth of the principals had twenty-one or more years of experience as principals. Viewed as a whole the data in Table IX seem to indicate that large numbers of new people have recently come into the principalship and that this trend is continuing.

TABLE IX
DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS BY EXPERIENCE AS PRINCIPAL

Length of Experience As Principal	No. of Principals	Per Cent
1 year	23	12.64
2 to 3 years	23	12.64
4 to 6 years	30	16.48
7 to 9 years	30	16.48
10 to 12 years	27	14.84
13 to 15 years	13	7.14
16 to 18 years	10	5.49
19 to 20 years	7	3.84
21 years or more	19	10.44
Total	182 ^a	99.99

^aOne principal did not respond to this item.

Finally, in examining the length of tenure as principals in their present schools, as shown in Table X, it is immediately obvious

that most principals have not been in their present positions for long. The largest group, constituting 28.02 per cent, were in their first year at the time the data were collected. Only 10.44 per cent of the principals in the sample had been in their present positions for more than ten years.

TABLE X

DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPALS BY LENGTH OF TENURE AS PRINCIPAL IN
PRESENT SCHOOL

Length of Tenure as Principal in Present School	No. of Principals	Per Cent
1 year	51	28.02
2 years	25	13.74
3 or 4 years	39	21.43
5 or 6 years	24	13.18
7 or 8 years	18	9.89
9 or 10 years	6	3.29
11 to 15 years	9	4.94
16 to 20 years	7	3.85
21 years or more	3	1.65
Total	182 ^a	99.99

^aOne principal did not respond to this item.

II. THE SCHOOLS

Though this was not specifically asked in the questionnaire the locations of the schools were determined by examination of the school addresses. It was found that seventy-three schools were located in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, while 112 schools were located in the smaller cities, towns, villages, and other

communities of Alberta. This latter group of schools included schools from all major geographical areas of Alberta. The total sample of schools includes representatives from the public school and separate school systems in the province.

Table XI presents some data on school size as indicated by the number of teachers within the school. The largest number of schools were in the ten to fourteen teacher category. Fifty-four schools, constituting 29.19 per cent of the sample, were in this category. The next largest group, consisting of forty schools, was in the adjoining category of fifteen to nineteen teachers. Only three schools had fewer than five teachers, and, at the other end of the continuum, only five schools had forty or more teachers. Complete data are presented in Table XI.

TABLE XI
DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS BY NUMBER OF TEACHERS

Number of Teachers	No. of Schools	Per Cent
Fewer than 5	3	1.62
5 to 9	21	11.35
10 to 14	54	29.19
15 to 19	40	21.62
20 to 24	26	14.05
25 to 29	22	11.89
30 to 39	14	7.56
40 to 49	2	1.08
50 or more	3	1.62
Total	185	99.98

The schools in this sample varied widely in grade range and level. Although nine categories were used in the questionnaire and are shown in Table XII, these may be combined into four groups. The elementary schools, including grades one to six, numbered fifty-nine making up 31.89 per cent of the sample of schools while the elementary-junior high schools, enrolling pupils in grades one to eight or nine, numbered forty-three making up 23.25 per cent of the sample. Thirty-six schools including grades one to eleven or twelve may be thought of as combined schools and represent 19.46 per cent of the sample. A final group of forty-seven schools making up 25.38 per cent of the sample, may be labelled secondary schools since they include some combination of grades between seven and twelve inclusive.

TABLE XII
DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS BY GRADES INCLUDED

Grades Included	No. of Schools	Per Cent
1 - 6	59	31.89
1 - 8	13	7.03
1 - 9	30	16.22
1 - 11	3	1.62
1 - 12	33	17.84
7 - 9	14	7.56
7 - 12	12	6.48
9 - 12	7	3.78
10 - 12	14	7.56
Total	185	99.98

III. RESPONDENTS TO THE OCDQ

A total of 1702 teachers and principals responded to the OCDQ. The instructions were that principals were to indicate their position in item seventy-three and omit items seventy-four and seventy-five. Because a number of teachers also failed to respond to these items, and because some principals failed to indicate their positions in item seventy-three any differentiation in this sample between teachers and principals would tend to be uncertain. Hence in this description of respondents to the OCDQ no differentiation between teachers and principals will be made. It may be noted, however, that those principals who did respond to the OCDQ are among the principals described in the first section of this chapter.

The data in a recent research monograph² published by the Alberta Teachers' Association makes it possible to make some comparisons between this sample of respondents and the total Alberta teaching force. No attempt will be made to test statistically whether the sample described here is representative of the total teaching force but comparison will be made to show some of the similarities and dissimilarities between the two groups.

Table XIII shows that approximately two-fifths of this sample was male and three-fifths was female. This distribution by

²M.T. Sillito and D.B. Black, The Alberta Teaching Force, 1964 (Research Monograph Number 10, Edmonton: The Alberta Teachers' Association, 1965).

sex of the respondents to the OCDQ is within three per cent of the distribution by sex of the total Alberta teaching force in 1964-65.

TABLE XIII

DISTRIBUTION BY SEX OF THE RESPONDENTS TO THE OCDQ
AND OF THE ALBERTA TEACHING FORCE

Sex	Respondents to OCDQ	Per Cent	Alberta Teaching Force ^a	Per Cent
Male	654	39.16	5335	36.19
Female	1016	60.84	9408	63.81
Total	1670 ^b	100.00	14,743	100.00

^aThis data comes from Research Monograph Number 10 footnoted previously.

^bNo data on sex available for 32 respondents.

The distribution by age of the respondents to the OCDQ is shown in Table XIV. The number of teachers in the younger age groups is generally greater than the number of teachers in the older age groups. Taking into account the expansion which is occurring in the educational system, this is to be expected. The median age of the respondents in the sample is 37.1 years as compared to a median age of 37.5 years for the total Alberta teaching force in 1964-65.³

³Ibid., p. 7.

TABLE XIV
DISTRIBUTION BY AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS
TO THE OCDQ

Age	Number of Respondents	Per Cent
Under 24 years	319	18.89
25-29 years	269	15.93
30-34 years	172	10.18
35-39 years	199	11.78
40-44 years	182	10.77
45-49 years	164	9.71
50-54 years	201	11.90
55-59 years	116	6.87
60 years and over	67	3.97
Total	1689 ^a	100.00

^aNo data on age available for 13 respondents.

The median years of training for respondents to the OCDQ was calculated to be 2.0 years. This would appear to be significantly different from the median of 2.9 years for the total Alberta teaching force⁴ in 1964-65, although no statistical tests were applied. The distribution by years of training of the respondents to the OCDQ is shown in Table XV. The largest group of teachers had only one year of training.

⁴Ibid., p. 15.

TABLE XV

DISTRIBUTION BY YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE
RESPONDENTS TO THE OCDQ

Years of Training	No. of Respondents	Per Cent
1 year	467	27.70
2 years	387	22.95
3 years	173	10.26
4 years	385	22.84
5 years	157	9.31
6 years	117	6.94
Total	1686 ^a	100.00

^aNo data on years of training available for 16 respondents.

There does not appear to be anything particularly significant in the distribution of respondents to the OCDQ according to years of teaching experience. Complete data appears in Table XVI. The median of years of teaching experience of respondents in this sample is 9.8 years. The median of years of teaching experience of the Alberta teaching force in 1964-65 was 9.4 years.⁵

⁵Ibid., p. 25.

TABLE XVI

DISTRIBUTION BY YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE
OF THE RESPONDENTS TO THE OCDQ

Length of Teaching Experience	No. of Respondents	Per Cent
1 year	128	7.57
2 years	141	8.34
3 or 4 years	206	12.19
5 or 6 years	172	10.18
7 or 8 years	110	6.51
9 or 10 years	117	6.92
11 to 15 years	292	17.28
16 to 20 years	229	13.55
21 years or more	295	17.46
Total	1690 ^a	100.00

^aNo data on teaching experience available for 12 respondents.

A study of the sample indicates that the mobility of the respondents is about the same as that of teachers in the province generally. Data from the research monograph indicates that of the 1964-65 teaching force in Alberta 75.10 per cent of the teachers were teaching for their present school board during the previous year, thus indicating that 24.90 per cent of the teachers were not.⁶ In the sample of respondents to the OCDQ 28.73 per cent of the teachers were spending their first year in the school. Taking into account that some transfers occur from one school to another within a system administered by one school board, it seems likely that the

⁶Ibid., p. 29.

percentage of teachers spending their first year in the school is about the same in the sample as for the province as a whole. The complete distribution by length of tenure in the present school of the respondents to the OCDQ is given in Table XVII.

TABLE XVII
DISTRIBUTION BY LENGTH OF TENURE IN PRESENT SCHOOL
OF THE RESPONDENTS TO THE OCDQ

Length of Tenure in Present School	No. of Respondents	Per Cent
1 year	485	28.73
2 years	318	18.84
3 or 4 years	299	17.71
5 or 6 years	202	11.96
7 or 8 years	132	7.82
9 or 10 years	87	5.15
11 to 15 years	108	6.40
16 to 20 years	37	2.19
21 years or more	20	1.18
Total	1688 ^a	99.98

^aNo data on tenure available for 14 respondents.

IV. SUMMARY

To summarize the description of the sample of principals it may be said that the majority of the principals in this study were male, middle-aged, in possession of a fair degree of preparation though somewhat lacking in the field of educational administration, relatively new to the principalship, and

relatively new to the positions they held when these data were collected.

The only restriction placed on school participation in this study was that the school have four or more teachers. The sample included schools with from four to over fifty teachers, located in all parts of Alberta, and from both public and separate school systems. Included were schools with all common grade combinations and ranges.

The sample made up of respondents to the OCDQ, including both teachers and principals without any differentiation, is not unlike the total teaching force in Alberta in regard to distributions by sex, age, years of teaching experience, and tenure in present school. There does appear to be a significant difference between the sample and total population in regard to years of teacher training. Finally, the size of this sample merits some comment. In 1964-65 the total teaching force of Alberta consisted of 14,743 personnel; this sample of 1702 included 11.5 per cent of the total teaching force.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS OF DATA

This chapter outlines the procedures used in the analysis of data. It indicates the source of the data, the treatments to which they were exposed, and the results of these treatments. The significance of the results is also discussed.

The null hypotheses which were formulated to serve as a guide for this study fall naturally into two groups. The first five hypotheses regard the role perceptions of principals as independent variables and are concerned with the relationships of these role perceptions to certain characteristics of the schools which may be dependent upon the manner in which principals perceive their role. The remaining six hypotheses regard the role perceptions of principals as being dependent on certain characteristics of the school and the principal and are concerned with the relationships which exist in this area.

Hypotheses Regarding Role Perceptions as Independent Variables

Hypothesis Number One. This hypothesis stated that there are no significant relationships between the principal's role perceptions and the climate classification of his school.

The data required to test this hypothesis were obtained from both questionnaires used in this study. Table XVIII shows

the distribution of schools by climate and the means for each dimension of the principal's role perceptions by climates. One hundred and eighty-three schools and an equal number of principals were used in the testing of this hypothesis.

TABLE XVIII

DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS BY CLIMATE AND MEANS FOR EACH DIMENSION OF THE PRINCIPAL'S ROLE PERCEPTIONS

(N=183)

Climate	Number of Schools	Per Cent	Means			
			Status	Authority	Personal	Means-Ends
Open	43	23.50	48.470	50.403	50.601	50.918
Autonomous	23	12.57	48.167	50.713	48.156	51.847
Controlled	36	19.67	50.604	49.884	53.453	49.210
Familiar	13	7.10	50.137	42.052	49.352	47.890
Paternal	19	10.38	50.285	50.674	48.790	48.280
Closed	49	26.77	51.967	51.680	48.492	49.811

Analysis of variance was used in testing this hypothesis. The mean score for each dimension of the principal's role perceptions for the schools in each climate classification was computed and the F ratio and probability were determined.

For the Status Dimension an F value of 0.76 and a probability value of 0.583 indicate that the differences between means in

the status dimensions among the six climate classifications are not significant, the probability being that differences as great or greater than those shown here will occur in fifty-eight per cent of random samples. Table XIX shows the essential results of the analysis of variance for this dimension.

TABLE XIX
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SCORES IN THE STATUS DIMENSION
BY CLIMATES

Source	SS	MS	DF	F	P
Groups	380.85938	76.171875	5	0.76	0.583
Error	17854.656	100.87376	177		

For the Authority Dimension, an F value of 2.02 and a probability value of 0.078 again do not meet the .05 level of significance which was set as a minimum requirement. Table XX shows the essential results of the analysis of variance for the Authority Dimension.

TABLE XX
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SCORES IN THE AUTHORITY DIMENSION
BY CLIMATES

Source	SS	MS	DF	F	P
Groups	984.79687	196.95937	5	2.02	0.078
Error	17282.402	97.640690	177		

For the Personal Dimension, an F value of 1.33 and a probability value of 0.255 also do not meet the .05 level of significance. Table XXI shows the essential results of the analysis of variance for the Personal Dimension.

TABLE XXI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SCORES IN THE PERSONAL DIMENSION
BY CLIMATES

Source	SS	MS	DF	F	P
Groups	667.56640	133.51328	5	1.33	0.255
Error	17829.832	100.73351	177		

In the Means-Ends Dimension, an F value of 0.49 and a probability value of 0.781 indicates that this dimension also does not meet the minimum requirement for significance. Table XXII shows the essential results of the analysis of variance for the Means-Ends Dimension.

TABLE XXII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF SCORES IN THE MEANS-ENDS DIMENSION
BY CLIMATES

Source	SS	MS	DF	F	P
Groups	251.68750	50.337499	5	0.49	0.781
Error	18043.930	101.94310	177		

Since the statistical test used here indicates clearly that the differences in means between climate classifications which occurred in each of the dimensions of the principal's role perceptions are not significant and could occur by chance alone more than five per cent of the time, the null hypothesis that no significant relationships exist between the principal's role perceptions and the climate classification of his school is accepted. Only in the authority dimension does the probability score approach significance. It may be that further study in this area may reveal a relationship between principals' perceptions in the Authority Dimension and the climate classifications of their schools.

Hypothesis Number Two. This hypothesis stated that there are no significant relationships between the principal's role perceptions and the school's scores on the subtests of the OCDQ.

This hypothesis was tested by the use of Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients. The correlation coefficients were computed between the principals' scores on the four dimensions of the principals' role perception, using the standardized scores with a mean of fifty and a standard deviation of ten, and the schools' scores on the subtests of the OCDQ, also standardized to a mean of fifty and a standard deviation of ten. Table XXIII shows all the correlations computed. Correlation coefficients significant at the .05 level of confidence are underlined.

TABLE XXIII
 RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SCORES IN DIMENSIONS OF
 PRINCIPAL ROLE PERCEPTION AND
 SUBTEST SCORES ON THE OCDQ
 (N = 183 Schools)

Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	OCDQ Subtests					
	Dis	Hin	Esp.	Int	AL	PE
Status Dimension	.040 ^a	-.000	<u>-.167^b</u>	-.071	-.013	-.004
Authority Dimension	-.069	-.054	-.073	-.111	.015	.019
Personal Dimension	<u>-.169</u>	-.045	.092	-.126	.057	.108
Means-Ends Dimension	.011	.028	.073	.049	.090	.044

^aAll coefficients are Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients.

^bUnderlined coefficients are significant at the .05 level.

Of thirty-two correlations, only two proved significant at the .05 level. There was a negative relationship between Esprit and Status indicating that an emphasis on status differences by the principal tends to be associated with low scores on Esprit within the school. The other significant relationship was also negative and was found between Disengagement and the Personal Dimension. It appears that an emphasis on universalism by the principal is associated with a low score on Disengagement in the school. One other relationship, between Consideration and the Authority Dimension, approaches significance at the .05 level. Though lacking the significance set as a minimum requirement, it suggests that behavior on the part of a principal which encourages independence of teachers is associated with a low score on Consideration for the principal. All other correlation coefficients are too small to indicate significant relationships.

The significant correlations must be interpreted with caution. Since no a priori hypotheses were established predicting the kinds of relationships which might exist between the principals' role perceptions and the schools' scores on the sub-tests, and since the .05 level of confidence was selected in testing the significance of the correlation coefficients, it is possible that a group of thirty-two correlation coefficients would contain one or two significant correlations by chance alone.

Though caution is needed, examination of some of the items in the subtests reveals that the relationships shown are reasonable and in general agreement with theory. Looking at the negative relationship between Esprit and Status it seems reasonable to believe that principals who emphasize status differences and agree with statements such as "A principal should be more like a superintendent than like a teacher" would have many teachers on their staffs who would respond negatively to such statements in the OCDQ subtest, Esprit, as (a) In faculty meetings, there is a feeling of "let's get things done," (b) There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally, (c) Teachers at this school show much school spirit, (d) The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure, and (e) The morale of the teachers is high.

The same sort of reasoning may explain the negative relationship between Disengagement and the Personal Dimension. Principal behavior which emphasizes universalism, as indicated by agreement with a statement such as "A principal should not visit the homes of some teachers any more often than he visits the homes of others," seems likely to be associated with negative responses by teachers to questions on the OCDQ subtest, Disengagement, such as (a) There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority, (b) Teachers seek special favors from the principal, (c) Teachers socialize together in small, select groups, and (d) Teachers at

this school stay by themselves. There is much less likelihood of the development of cliques, intergroup rivalries, and petty jealousies when the principal employs universalistic criteria in his relationships with his staff.

The presence of so few significant relationships lead to the question of whether two or more dimensions of the principals' role perceptions taken together would be more efficient in predicting scores on the subtests of the OCDQ. To pursue this further, multiple correlation R, for prediction of subtest scores from the dimensions of the principal's role perceptions was calculated for each subtest. The results are shown in Tables XXIV to XXXI.

Table XXIV shows that school scores on Disengagement are negatively related to principal scores in the Personal Dimension. The multiple regression indicates that the Personal and Status Dimensions contribute most to the accountable variation, which, however, is very small. Only 3.76 per cent of the variation in Disengagement scores can be predicted from the four dimensions. Table XXVI reveals that 5.30 per cent of the variation in Esprit scores can be predicted from scores in the dimensions of role perception. The Status and Personal Dimensions contribute most to the accountable variation. All values of R in this table are significant at the .05 level of confidence.

Scores in the remaining subtests of the OCDQ are not

TABLE XXIV

MULTIPLE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF SCHOOL SCORES IN DISENGAGEMENT
BY DIMENSIONS OF PRINCIPAL ROLE PERCEPTION
(N = 183)

Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	Correlation With Disengagement	Beta Weight ($b_0 = .57.3790$)	% of Variation Accounted for Stepwise	Cumulative Total % of Variation	Multiple Correlation R
Personal Dimension	<u>-0.169</u> ^a	-0.1777	2.85	2.85	<u>0.169</u>
Status Limension	<u>0.040</u>	0.0705	0.47	3.32	<u>0.182</u>
Authority Dimension	<u>-0.069</u>	-0.0653	0.39	3.71	<u>0.192</u>
Means-Ends Dimension	<u>0.011</u>	0.0236	0.05	3.76	0.194

^aUnderlined coefficients are significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXV

MULTIPLE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF SCHOOL SCORES IN HINDRANCE
BY DIMENSIONS OF PRINCIPAL ROLE PERCEPTION
(N = 183)

Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	Correlation With Hindrance	Beta Weight ($b_0 = .52.6943$)	% of Variation Accounted for Stepwise	Cumulative Total % of Variation	Multiple Correlation R
Authority Dimension	<u>-0.054</u>	-0.0567	0.29	0.29	<u>0.054</u>
Personal Dimension	<u>-0.045</u>	-0.0438	0.19	0.48	<u>0.069</u>
Means-Ends Dimension	<u>0.028</u>	0.0349	0.11	0.59	<u>0.077</u>
Status Dimension	<u>0.000</u>	0.0107	0.01	0.60	0.078

^aUnderlined coefficients are significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXVI

MULTIPLE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF SCHOOL SCORES IN ESPRIT
BY DIMENSIONS OF PRINCIPAL ROLE PERCEPTION
(N = 183)

Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	Correlation With Esprit	Beta Weight ($b_0 = .7429$)	% of Variation Accounted for Stepwise	Cumulative Total % of Variation	Multiple Correlation R
Status Dimension	<u>-0.167</u>	-0.1831	2.80	2.80	<u>0.167</u>
Personal Dimension	<u>0.092</u>	0.1260	1.48	4.28	<u>0.199</u>
Authority Dimension	<u>-0.073</u>	-0.0911	0.72	5.00	<u>0.223</u>
Means-Ends Dimension	0.073	0.0554	0.29	5.30	<u>0.230</u>

^aUnderlined coefficients are significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXVII

MULTIPLE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF SCHOOLS SCORES IN INTIMACY
BY DIMENSIONS OF PRINCIPAL ROLE PERCEPTION
(N = 183)

Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	Correlation With Intimacy	Beta Weight ($b_0 = .6254$)	% of Variation Accounted for Stepwise	Cumulative Total % of Variation	Multiple Correlation R
Personal Dimension	<u>-0.126</u>	-0.1117	1.59	1.59	<u>0.126</u>
Authority Dimension	<u>-0.111</u>	-0.1162	1.18	2.77	<u>0.166</u>
Status Dimension	<u>-0.071</u>	-0.0493	0.33	3.10	<u>0.176</u>
Means-Ends Dimension	0.049	0.0479	0.22	3.33	<u>0.182</u>

^aUnderlined coefficients are significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXVIII

MULTIPLE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF SCHOOL SCORES IN ALOOFNESS
BY DIMENSIONS OF PRINCIPAL ROLE PERCEPTION
(N = 183)

Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	Correlation With Aloofness	Beta Weight ($b_0 = 42.5916$)	% of Variation Accounted for Stepwise	Cumulative Total % of Variation	Multiple Correlation R
Means-Ends Dimension	0.090	0.0916	0.81	. 0.81	0.090
Personal Dimension	0.057	0.0613	0.37	1.18	0.109
Status Dimension	-0.013	-0.0062	0.00	1.18	0.109
Authority Dimension	0.015	0.0022	0.00	1.19	0.109

^aUnderlined coefficients are significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXIX

MULTIPLE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF SCHOOL SCORES IN PRODUCTION EMPHASIS
BY DIMENSIONS OF PRINCIPAL ROLE PERCEPTION

(N = 183)

Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	Correlation With Production Emphasis ($b_0 = 42.3868$)	Beta Weight	% of Variation Accounted for Stepwise	Cumulative Total % of Variation	Multiple Correlation R
Personal Dimension	0.108	0.1109	1.17	1.17	0.108
Means-Ends Dimension	0.044	0.0451	0.24	1.41	0.119
Status Dimension	-0.004	-0.0139	0.02	1.43	0.120
Authority Dimension	0.019	0.0109	0.01	1.45	0.120

^aUnderlined coefficients are significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXX

MULTIPLE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF SCHOOL SCORES IN THRUST
BY DIMENSION OF PRINCIPAL ROLE PERCEPTION
(N = 183)

Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	Correlation With Thrust	Beta Weight ($b_0 = 52.5023$)	% of Variation Accounted for Stepwise	Cumulative Total % of Variation	Multiple Correlation R
Authority Dimension	-0.115	-0.1246	1.31	1.31	0.115
Personal Dimension	0.110	0.1255	1.25	2.56	0.160
Status Dimension	-0.054	-0.0768	0.64	3.20	0.179
Means-Ends Dimension	0.021	0.0272	0.07	3.28	0.181

^aUnderlined coefficients are significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXXI

MULTIPLE REGRESSION PREDICTION OF SCHOOL SCORES IN CONSIDERATION
BY DIMENSIONS OF PRINCIPAL ROLE PERCEPTION
(N = 183)

Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	Correlation With Consideration	Beta Weight ($b_0 = 61.0470$)	% of Variation Accounted for Stepwise	Cumulative Total % of Variation	Multiple Correlation R
Authority Dimension	-0.142	-0.1473	2.01	2.01	0.142
Status Dimension	-0.087	-0.1015	0.89	2.90	0.170
Personal Dimension	0.014	0.0334	0.11	3.01	0.173
Means-Ends Dimension	-0.006	-0.0057	0.00	3.01	0.173

^aUnderlined coefficients are significant at the .05 level.

predictable from dimensions of principal role perception. The values of R in Table XXV, Table XXVII, Table XXVIII, Table XXIX, Table XXX, and Table XXXI are not significant even at the .05 level of confidence.

On the basis of the Pearson product-moment correlations and the values of R, the null hypothesis that there are no significant relationships between the principal's role perceptions and the school's scores on the subtests of the OCDQ is accepted with the exception that a weak relationship seems to exist between the Status Dimension and Esprit, and between the Personal Dimension and Disengagement. However, there is always the possibility that these correlations are spurious.

Hypothesis Number Three. This hypothesis stated that there are no significant relationships between the mean rating of a school's effectiveness given by teachers and the principal's role perceptions.

The data required to test this hypothesis were obtained from the OCDQ and the Principal's Questionnaire. The rating of school effectiveness was obtained from a single question contained in the questionnaire appended to the OCDQ. Respondents, which included both teachers and principals, were asked to answer the question, "Compared with other schools known to you, how good a job do you judge your school does in educating the students who come to it?"

on a six-point scale ranging from "outstanding" to "very poor." A rating of "outstanding" was given a score of one, while a rating of "very poor" was given a score of six. Thus low numbers indicate high ratings and high numbers indicate low ratings. The rating of effectiveness for a particular school was the mean rating score assigned by the respondents to the OCDQ who replied to the question. For all schools in the sample the mean rating was 2.46 and the standard deviation was 0.41.

To test the hypothesis, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between dimensions of principal role perception and ratings of school effectiveness were computed. Table XXXII shows

TABLE XXXII

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DIMENSIONS
OF PRINCIPAL ROLE PERCEPTION AND RATINGS
OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS

(N = 183)

Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	r	Level of Significance ^a
Status Dimension	0.072	NS
Authority Dimension	0.074	NS
Personal Dimension	-0.180	.05
Means-Ends Dimension	0.037	NS

^aA value of .145 is required for significance at the .05 level.

these correlation coefficients. Three of the four correlation coefficients are not significantly different from zero. Only between the scores in the Personal Dimension and the mean ratings of school effectiveness is the correlation coefficient significant at the .05 level of confidence. This relationship indicates that high ratings of school effectiveness are associated with universalistic behavior by the principal.

As a further test of this hypothesis the schools were dichotomized on the dimensions of role perception and mean ratings of school effectiveness were determined. Tests of significance were then used to determine if the differences in means were significant. Table XXXIII reports the results of these analyses.

TABLE XXXIII

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES IN MEAN RATINGS OF SCHOOL EFFECTIVENESS WHEN SCHOOLS ARE DICHOTOMIZED ON THE DIMENSIONS OF ROLE PERCEPTION
(N = 183)

Dimensions of Role Perception	N	Mean Rating of School Effectiveness	Value of t	Level of Significance
Above Mean in Status	92	2.48		
Below Mean in Status	91	2.44	0.502	NS
Above Mean in Authority	95	2.47		
Below Mean in Authority	88	2.45	0.233	NS
Above Mean in Personal	81	2.37		
Below Mean in Personal	102	2.53	2.718	.01
Above Mean in Means-Ends	86	2.46		
Below Mean in Means-Ends	97	2.46	0.119	NS

The differences in means for the Status, Authority, and Means-Ends Dimensions are very small and are not statistically significant. However, in the Personal Dimension the difference is significant at the .01 level of confidence. The principals who scored above the mean in the Personal Dimension--in other words, who emphasize universalism--are associated with significantly higher ratings of school effectiveness.

This relationship was expected. It was found in testing the second hypothesis that an emphasis on universalism by the principal is associated with a low score in Disengagement. In schools where Disengagement is low, where staffs are not subjected to the presence of cliques, group rivalries, or divided loyalties, it would be expected that teachers would tend to regard their schools as being effective. Thus the employment of universalistic criteria by principals in their dealings with teachers should lead to higher ratings of school effectiveness.

Null hypothesis number three that there are no significant relationships between the mean rating of a school's effectiveness given by teachers and the principal's role perceptions is accepted for the Status, Authority, and Means-Ends Dimensions, and rejected for the Personal Dimension.

Hypothesis Number Four. This hypothesis stated that there are no significant relationships between the mean rating of teacher satisfaction and the principal's role perceptions.

Teacher satisfaction was determined from a single question contained in the questionnaire appended to the OCDQ. Teachers only were required to respond to the question, "How well satisfied are you with all aspects of your teaching situation in your present school?" on a six-point scale ranging from "enthusiastic" to "very dissatisfied." A rating of "enthusiastic" was given a score of one, while a rating of "very dissatisfied" was given a score of six. The mean teacher satisfaction for a particular school was the mean rating score assigned by the teacher respondents from that school. For all schools in the sample the mean of teacher satisfaction was 2.35 and the standard deviation was 0.53.

As in the previous hypothesis, Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between dimensions of principal role perception and mean teacher satisfaction were computed. These are reported in Table XXXIV. None of the correlation coefficients is significantly different from zero.

TABLE XXXIV

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DIMENSIONS
 OF PRINCIPAL ROLE PERCEPTION AND RATINGS
 OF TEACHER SATISFACTION

(N = 183)

Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	r	Level of Significance ^a
Status Dimension	0.004	NS
Authority Dimension	0.112	NS
Personal Dimension	-0.101	NS
Means-Ends Dimension	0.025	NS

^aA value of .145 is required for significance at the .05 level.

To further test this hypothesis the schools were dichotomized on the dimensions of role perceptions and mean ratings of teacher satisfaction were determined. Tests of significance were then used to determine if the differences in means were significant. The results are shown in Table XXXV. None of the differences in means was significant.

The null hypothesis that there are no significant relationships between the mean rating of teacher satisfaction and the principal's role perceptions is accepted for all four dimensions.

TABLE XXXV

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES IN MEAN RATINGS OF
 TEACHER SATISFACTION WHEN SCHOOLS ARE DICHOTOMIZED
 ON THE DIMENSIONS OF ROLE PERCEPTION

(N = 183)

Dimensions of Role Perception	N	Mean Rating of Teacher Satisfaction	Value of t	Level of Significance
Above Mean in Status	92	2.32		
Below Mean in Status	91	2.39	0.899	NS
Above Mean in Authority	95	2.40		
Below Mean in Authority	88	2.31	1.130	NS
Above Mean in Personal	81	2.27		
Below Mean in Personal	102	2.42	1.885	NS
Above Mean in Means-Ends	86	2.35		
Below Mean in Means-Ends	97	2.36	0.167	NS

Hypothesis Number Five. This hypothesis stated that there are no significant relationships between the mean rating by the teachers of their principal's effectiveness and the principal's role perceptions.

Required data were obtained from both the OCDQ and the Principal's Questionnaire. The ratings of principals' effectiveness were determined from a single question contained in the questionnaire appended to the OCDQ. Teacher respondents were asked to answer the question, "How effective do you consider your principal to be in performing all the various functions which he should perform?"

on a six-point scale ranging from "outstanding" to "very poor." A rating of "outstanding" was given a score of one, while a rating of "very poor" was given a score of six. The rating of a particular principal's effectiveness was the mean rating score assigned by those of his teachers who responded to the OCDQ and replied to the question. For all schools in the sample the mean rating was 2.30 and the standard deviation was 0.64.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients between dimensions of principal role perception and mean ratings of principals' effectiveness were computed, as in the testing of the two previous hypotheses. Table XXXVI shows these correlation coefficients. None of the coefficients is significantly different from zero.

TABLE XXXVI
PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DIMENSIONS
OF PRINCIPAL ROLE PERCEPTION AND RATINGS
OF THE PRINCIPALS' EFFECTIVENESS
(N = 183)

Dimensions of Principal Role Perception	r	Level of Significance ^a
Status Dimension	0.057	NS
Authority Dimension	0.119	NS
Personal Dimension	-0.107	NS
Means-Ends Dimension	0.077	NS

^aA value of .145 is required for significance at the .05 level.

As a further test of this hypothesis the schools were dichotomized on the dimensions of role perception and mean ratings of the principals' effectiveness were determined. Tests of significance were then used to determine if the differences in means were significant. Table XXXVII reports the results of these computations. The values of "t" do not reach the level of significance required for rejection of the null hypothesis, and null hypothesis number five is accepted for all four dimensions.

TABLE XXXVII

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES IN MEAN RATINGS OF
PRINCIPALS' EFFECTIVENESS WHEN SCHOOLS ARE DICHOTOMIZED
ON THE DIMENSIONS OF ROLE PERCEPTION

(N = 183)

Dimensions of Role Perception	N	Mean Rating of Principals' Effectiveness	Value of t	Level of Significance
Above Mean in Status	92	2.30		
Below Mean in Status	91	2.31	0.141	NS
Above Mean in Authority	95	2.32		
Below Mean in Authority	88	2.29	0.305	NS
Above Mean in Personal	81	2.22		
Below Mean in Personal	102	2.37	1.606	NS
Above Mean in Means-Ends	86	2.31		
Below Mean in Means-Ends	97	2.30	0.178	NS

Hypotheses Regarding Role Perceptions as Dependent Variables

Hypothesis Number Six. The sixth hypothesis stated that there are no significant relationships between school size and the principal's role perceptions. The nine classifications of schools reported in Table XI in Chapter IV were regrouped to give three classifications. Schools having four to fourteen teachers were considered to be small schools. Schools having fifteen to twenty-four teachers were classified as medium-sized schools, while those having twenty-five or more teachers were considered to be large schools.

Analysis of variance was used to determine if the differences between means of the three classifications in the four dimensions of role perception were significant. Examination of Table XXXVIII, which shows the essential results in this analysis of variances, indicates that the differences in means are very small and the F ratios in all four dimensions did not reach significance at the .05 level. However, the variances in the Means-Ends Dimension seem to indicate that principals in large schools agree least among themselves in their perceptions of their roles in this dimension while principals in the medium-sized schools in contrast, agree much more among themselves. In the Personal Dimension the increasing size of the variance from small schools to large schools indicates that principals agree less and less among themselves in their perceptions of their role in this dimension as school size increases.

TABLE XXXVIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF PRINCIPALS
 IN FOUR DIMENSIONS OF ROLE PERCEPTION
 BY SIZE OF SCHOOL

(N = 183)

Size of School	N	Means			
		Status	Authority	Personal	Means-Ends
Small schools 4-14 teachers	76	49.862	49.937	51.767	49.220
Medium-sized schools 15-24 teachers	66	50.507	50.584	48.495	50.395
Large schools 25 or more teachers	41	49.864	49.696	49.206	50.425
Variances		79.434 121.523 101.476	117.012 84.092 92.684	82.942 103.922 120.060	89.870 74.850 157.629
With-in Group Variances		101.211	101.350	100.472	101.294
F Ratios		0.086	0.119	2.053	0.309

On the basis of these results null hypothesis number six is accepted. There are no significant relationships between school size and the principal's role perceptions in the four dimensions.

Hypothesis Number Seven. The seventh hypothesis stated that there are no significant relationships between the type of school and the principal's role perceptions.

All required data were obtained from the Principal's Questionnaire. The schools were classified into four types. There were fifty-eight elementary schools containing grades one to six. Forty-three schools were elementary-junior high schools containing grades one to eight or nine. Combined schools, containing grades one to eleven or twelve, totalled thirty-five, and secondary schools, containing junior high grades or senior high grades or some combination of the two, numbered forty-seven.

Analysis of variance was used to determine if the differences between means of the four types of schools in the four dimensions of role perception were significant. Table XXXIX shows the means for each type of school. Of greatest interest are the means in the Personal Dimension. These means decrease consistently as the median

TABLE XXXIX
MEANS OF ROLE PERCEPTIONS
BY TYPE OF SCHOOL

Type of School	N	Status	Authority	Personal	Means-Ends
Elementary Gr. 1 to 6	58	49.299	49.114	53.152	51.873
Elementary-Jr. High Gr. 1 to 8 or 9	43	50.961	50.799	51.053	47.884
Combined Gr. 1 to 11 or 12	35	48.757	52.028	48.860	48.429
Secondary Gr. 7 or 9 to 9 or 12	47	51.280	49.306	46.047	50.457

grade found in the school increases. Since a high score in the Personal Dimension indicates universalistic behavior the indication is that principals tend to favor more particularistic behavior as the median grade level in their schools rises. In addition to the consistency of change of mean in this dimension, the greatest differences in means occur here. Examination of the F ratios shown in Table XL reveals that the F ratio in the Personal Dimension is significant at the .01 level. Values of F in the other dimensions are not significant.

TABLE XL
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF PRINCIPALS
IN FOUR DIMENSIONS OF ROLE PERCEPTION BY
TYPES OF SCHOOLS
(N = 183)

Type of School	Variances			
	Status	Authority	Personal	Means-Ends
Elem. Schools	93.565	102.988	62.598	94.277
Elem.-Jr. High Schools	108.688	105.667	117.087	92.802
Combined Schools	96.407	90.224	82.337	53.988
Sec. Schools	97.089	92.667	118.007	137.376
With-in Group Variances	100.770	100.727	95.495	99.468
F Ratios	0.654	0.784	4.900 ^a	1.645

^aSignificant at the .01 level.

The variances, also shown in Table XL indicate that in the Personal and Means-Ends Dimensions there are great differences in the amount of variation in perception of principals within the different types of schools. The variance in the Personal Dimension is 62.598 for principals of elementary schools, 117.087 for principals of elementary-junior high schools, 82.337 for principals of combined schools, and 118.007 for principals of secondary schools. These differences in variance do not appear to be related to any identifiable variable but do indicate that principals of elementary-junior high schools and secondary schools agree less among themselves than principals in the other two types of schools in their perceptions of their roles in the Personal Dimension. In the Means-Ends Dimension, a variance of 53.988 shows that principals of combined schools tend to perceive their roles in this dimension in much the same way, while a variance of 137.376 for principals of secondary schools indicates that this group of principals agree much less among themselves.

A series of "t" tests were carried out in the Personal Dimension, where the F value was significant at the .01 level, to determine where the significant differences in means occurred. Table XLI shows the computed values of "t" and their significances. The most significant difference in means exists between the elementary and secondary schools. A difference in means significant at the .02 level occurs between elementary-junior high schools and secondary schools, and a difference in means significant at the .05

level exists between elementary schools and combined schools. Three differences in mean are not significant.

Null hypothesis number seven, then, is accepted, in part, for the Status, Authority, and Means-Ends Dimensions, and rejected for the Personal Dimension where a relationship does exist between the type of school and the principal's role perceptions.

TABLE XLI

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEANS
IN THE PERSONAL DIMENSION BY TYPES OF SCHOOLS

(N = 183)

Types of Schools	Value of t	Level of Significance
Elem. and Elem.-Jr. High	1.067	NS
Elem. and Combined	2.055	.05
Elem. and Sec.	3.711	.001
Elem.-Jr. High & Combined	0.989	NS
Elem.-Jr. High and Sec.	2.428	.02
Combined and Sec.	1.289	NS

Hypothesis Number Eight. The eighth hypothesis stated that there are no significant relationships between the total teaching experience of the principal and his role perceptions. By total teaching experience is meant the number of years the principal has served as a teacher plus the number of years he has served as a

principal, whether he did some teaching or not during this period. Though hypothesis nine deals with experience in the principalship, it was felt this hypothesis was necessary to account for differences created when some principals are appointed with little previous teaching experience and others are appointed only after many years of teaching service.

Again, all required data were obtained from the Principal's Questionnaire. The classifications of principals used in the questionnaire were regrouped to give four classifications. The members of the first group, consisting of twenty-seven principals, had eight years or less of teaching experience. The next group of sixty-two principals had from nine to sixteen years of total teaching experience. The third group of thirty-seven principals had from seventeen to twenty-three years of total teaching experience, while the fourth group of fifty-four principals had twenty-four years or more of total teaching experience. For convenience, these groups will be referred to as first, second, third, and fourth groups.

To determine if the differences between means of the four groups of principals in the four dimensions of role perception were significant, analysis of variance was used. The essential results for this analysis of variance are reported in Table XLII. The F ratios are not significant at the .05 level, although in the Means-Ends Dimension the F value approaches significance at this level.

TABLE XLII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF PRINCIPALS IN FOUR
 DIMENSIONS OF ROLE PERCEPTION BY PRINCIPALS'
 TOTAL EXPERIENCE AS TEACHER AND PRINCIPAL
 (N=180)

Total Experience	N	Means			Means-Ends
		Status	Authority	Personal	
First Group 8 years or less	27	49.930	49.749	47.799	49.527
Second Group 9-16 years	62	50.547	49.661	49.340	49.158
Third Group 17-23 years	37	51.367	52.263	51.617	47.431
Fourth Group 24 years or more	54	48.898	49.072	50.908	52.863
Variances		152.477 110.011 87.311 63.927	116.414 92.081 119.050 84.185	123.290 89.229 104.444 90.311	62.033 99.429 74.747 120.153
With-in Group Variances		100.114	101.154	100.013	97.121
F Ratios		0.501	0.806	0.996	2.528

On the basis of these F values the null hypothesis that there are no significant relationships between the total teaching experience of the principal and his role perceptions is accepted.

However, though the evidence indicates no relationships exist, examination of the variances reveals an interesting fact. In the

Status Dimension the four variances are, from first group to fourth group, in consecutive order, 152.477, 110.011, 87.311, and 63.927.

It appears that the less experienced principals agree least among themselves in their perception of their roles in the Status Dimension, and that there is more and more congruity of perception as principals have more experience. In the Means-Ends Dimension the very small variance for the first group indicates that members of this group tend to agree in their perceptions of their roles in this dimension. In contrast, the fourth group, consisting of principals with most experience, has the largest variance, and thus seems to have least agreement of perception among its members.

Hypothesis Number Nine. This hypothesis stated that there are no significant relationships between the length of the principal's experience as a principal and his role perceptions.

The Principal's Questionnaire was the source of all required data. The one hundred and eighty-two principals for whom these data were available were classified into three groups. Forty-six principals had three years or less experience as principals. Sixty principals had from four to nine years experience in the principalship. The third group of seventy-six principals had ten or more years experience in the principalship.

Analysis of variance was used to determine if the differences between means for the three groups of principals in the four

dimensions of role perception were significant. The essential results are shown in Table XLIII. The values of F in the Status, Authority, and Personal Dimensions are not significant; the F value in the Means-Ends Dimension is significant at the .05 level.

Some of the variances, also shown in Table XLIII, show systematic change in two dimensions. In the discussion of hypothesis eight it was noted that there was more congruity of perception in the Status Dimension as principals have more total experience as teachers

TABLE XLIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF PRINCIPALS
IN FOUR DIMENSIONS OF ROLE PERCEPTION BY
EXPERIENCE IN THE PRINCIPALSHIP

(N = 182)

Length of Experience	N	Means			
		Status	Authority	Personal	Means-Ends
3 years or less	46	50.635	49.760	48.684	46.986
4 - 9 years	60	50.497	51.385	50.453	52.178
10 years or more	76	49.270	49.201	50.263	50.160
Variances		113.968 110.349 80.380	105.563 106.700 88.751	100.077 101.487 98.123	76.224 98.982 101.923
With-in Group Variances		100.404	100.575	101.397	96.041
F Ratios		0.368	0.823	0.474	3.667 ^a

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

and principals. This is reaffirmed by the variances in the Status Dimension in hypothesis nine; these decrease as length of experience as principal increases. Another set of variances showing systematic change is found in the Means-Ends Dimension; here the variance increases as length of experience as principal increases. It appears that the more experienced principals agree less among themselves about the emphasis which should be placed in this dimension than do the less experienced principals.

A series of "t" tests were carried out in the Means-Ends Dimension, where the F value was significant at the .05 level, to determine where the significant differences in means occurred. The results of these tests are shown in Table XLIV. They indicate that a difference between means, significant at the .01 level, exists between principals with three years or less experience and principals with four to nine years of experience. The other two "t" tests

TABLE XLIV

TESTS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEANS
IN THE MEANS-ENDS DIMENSION BY EXPERIENCE
IN THE PRINCIPALSHIP

Groups of Principals by Experience	Value of t	Level of Significance
3 years or less and 4-9 years	2.704	.01
3 years or less and 10 years or more	1.672	NS
4-9 years and 10 years or more	1.193	NS

indicate that the differences in means between other groups are not significant.

The null hypothesis that there are no significant relationships between length of experience in the principalship and the principal's role perceptions is accepted for the Status, Authority and Personal Dimensions, and rejected for the Means-Ends Dimension.

Hypothesis Number Ten. This hypothesis stated that there are no significant relationships between the amount of training possessed by the principal and his role perceptions.

All required data were obtained from the Principal's Questionnaire. The principals who had one, two or three years of training were combined in one group. Principals with four, five, and six years of training formed the other three groups.

Analysis of variance was used to determine if the differences between means for the four groups of principals in the four dimensions of role perception were significant. The essential results are shown in Table XLV. All F ratios do not meet the minimum .05 level of significance, and the differences in means are not sufficiently great to conclude that the four groups are not drawn from the same population. Therefore the null hypothesis that no relationship exists between the amount of training possessed by the principal and his role perceptions is accepted.

TABLE XLV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF PRINCIPALS
IN FOUR DIMENSIONS OF ROLE PERCEPTION BY
YEARS OF TRAINING OF THE PRINCIPAL

(N = 181)

Years of Training	N	Means			
		Status	Authority	Personal	Means-Ends
1-3 years	21	51.880	49.362	49.949	47.423
4 years	61	51.172	50.609	50.505	51.254
5 years	44	47.601	50.787	47.795	48.889
6 years	55	50.026	49.095	50.692	50.640
Variances		78.077	76.423	39.236	99.659
		78.528	77.578	87.379	77.436
		128.211	149.847	97.998	84.107
		100.961	93.235	132.275	128.114
With-in Group Variances		99.571	102.024	100.232	99.228
F Ratios		1.376	0.337	0.835	1.047

Examination of the variances reveals that in the Authority Dimension the variance is considerably larger for the principals with five years of training than it is for the other groups. This group has less agreement among its members in its perception of this dimension than do the other groups. In the Personal Dimension the variance increases in size as the amount of training possessed by the

principal increases. In addition to this systematic change, the extremes in variances are most marked. The more training the principals have, the less congruency there is in the way they perceive their roles in the Personal Dimension. This seems to indicate that the type of preparation received by the principals produces divergence rather than convergence of ideas in the area covered in this dimension.

Hypothesis Number Eleven. This hypothesis stated that there are no significant relationships between the amount of graduate work the principal has done in educational administration and his role perceptions.

The required data were obtained from the Principal's Questionnaire. Ninety-two principals have done no graduate work in educational administration, while eighty-eight principals have completed some work in this field. This latter group includes fifteen principals with graduate degrees in educational administration.

Analysis of variance was used to determine if the differences between means for the two groups of principals in the four dimensions of role perception are large enough to signify that the two groups are not random samples drawn from the same population. The essential results are shown in Table XLVI. The F ratios in the Status, Authority, and Personal Dimensions are not significant at the .05 level. In the Means-Ends Dimension, the F value of 4.047 is significant at the .05 level. The null hypothesis that there are

no significant relationships between the amount of graduate work the principal has done in educational administration and his role perceptions is accepted for the Status, Authority, and Personal Dimensions, and rejected for the Means-Ends Dimension. Principals who have done no graduate work in educational administration have different perceptions of their roles in the Means-Ends Dimension than do those who have done some graduate work.

TABLE XLVI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE ON SCORES OF PRINCIPALS IN FOUR DIMENSIONS OF ROLE PERCEPTION BY AMOUNT OF GRADUATE WORK DONE IN EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

(N=180)

Amount of Graduate Work Done in Ed. Admin.	N	Means			
		Status	Authority	Personal	Means-Ends
No Graduate Work	92	49.238	50.210	49.372	48.472
Some Graduate Work (including degree holders)	88	51.034	50.040	50.615	51.430
Variances		94.538 102.195	108.863 91.005	89.586 110.723	93.302 99.236
With-in Group Variances		99.386	101.257	101.042	97.284
F Ratios		1.461	0.013	0.687	4.047 ^a
T Ratios		1.209	0.115	0.829	2.012

^aSignificant at the .05 level.

Summary of Chapter V

Eleven null hypotheses were formulated and tested. Six of these null hypothesis were accepted in full, while five of them were partially rejected. No null hypothesis was rejected in full.

It was found that principals' scores in the four dimensions are unrelated to school climate. Weak negative relationships exist between the Status Dimension and Esprit subtest and between the Personal Dimension and the Disengagement subtest. Ratings of school effectiveness are related to the Personal Dimension, but ratings of teacher satisfaction and effectiveness of principals are independent of the principals' scores in the four dimensions of role perception.

When role perceptions were taken as dependent variables it was found that there were no significant relationships between school size and role perceptions of principals. The type of school is significantly related to scores in the Personal Dimension, but not to the other three dimensions. When experience and training of principals were considered, it was found that principals' scores in the Means-Ends Dimension are significantly related to length of experience in the principalship and to the amount of graduate work completed in educational administration.

Though few significant relationships were found in this study, some of the variances reported are of importance. It may be that

the most significant contribution of this study lies in these variances. It was found that principals agree less among themselves in their perceptions in the Personal Dimension as school size increases. Experience is another variable which seems to determine the extent of congruity of perception in the Status Dimension. The more experience principals have, the more they agree among themselves in their perceptions in this dimension. Experience in the principalship also seems to be related to the size of variance in the Means-Ends Dimension, but here the relationship is negative. The more experience principals have, the less they agree among themselves in their perceptions of their roles in this dimension. The same sort of negative relationship is found between the amount of training possessed by principals and the Personal Dimension. The more training the principals have, the less they agree among themselves in their perceptions of their roles in the Personal Dimension.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The preceding chapter outlined the procedures followed in the analysis of the data and reported the results of these treatments. This chapter summarizes and interprets the findings in four sections. The first section deals with the findings arising from hypotheses one and two, both of which are concerned with organizational climate. The next section discusses the results arising from hypotheses three, four and five, all of which deal with ratings given by teachers to their schools, on their own feelings of satisfaction, and on the effectiveness of their principals. The third section deals with the findings of hypotheses six and seven, both of which are concerned with characteristics of schools. The fourth section discusses the findings of hypotheses eight, nine, ten, and eleven, all of which deal with characteristics of the principal. This is followed by a brief discussion of the study and some implications.

Summary and Conclusions Related to Organizational Climate

One of the major purposes of this study was to determine if the perceptions which the principal has of his role has an effect on the school as a whole. Hypothesis one, dealing with climate classifications of schools, and hypothesis two, dealing with the subtests of the OCDQ, are both concerned with the school as a whole.

The lack of significant relationships between principals' role perceptions and climate classifications of their schools is not surprising when the nature of these classifications is considered. Though Halpin and Croft could not resist evaluating climates,¹ the school climate classifications which they identified are only names for commonly-occurring patterns of subtest scores. In discussing this matter, Andrews says that "the concepts Open and Closed, applied by analogy from psychology, appear to have little meaning except in terms of the descriptions of the profiles they represent,"² and supports this by asserting that "the overall Climate does not predict anything that the subtests do not predict better."³ The findings of this study add support to the acceptance of this view.

When attention is focused on the relationships of dimensions of role perception to OCDQ subtest scores, the lack of relationships seems to indicate that the nature of the school as described by OCDQ subtest scores is independent of the perceptions which the principal has of his role. Only two relationships, significant at the .05 level of confidence, were observed, and as noted these may have

¹ Andrew W. Halpin and Don B. Croft, The Organizational Climate of Schools (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1963). p. 6.

² John H.M. Andrews, "Some Validity Studies of the OCDQ." A paper delivered at the conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, February 10, 1965. p. 37.

³ Ibid.

occurred by chance alone. However, both relationships are in the direction one would expect on the basis of a rational analysis. It seems probable that an emphasis on status differences by the principal would be associated with low esprit in the school. The other relationship seems equally probable. A principal who employs universalistic criteria in his relationships with his staff members could, in this manner, help to minimize feelings of disengagement among his teachers. The lack of clear evidence in these relationships may be due to the wide age range of respondents to both questionnaires. A paper by Miklos suggests that expectations held by teachers for the behavior of principals differ between older and younger teachers.⁴ These differing expectations may be reflected in the Disengagement scores and it may be that a study limited to a narrow age range of teachers and principals would result in more definite findings in this area.

On the basis of the evidence in this study, it must be concluded that the manner in which the principal perceives his role in the four dimensions studied has little or no effect on his school as it is described by the OCDQ. The commonly held assumption that the principal is an important determinant of the climate of his school receives little support from this study at least insofar as

⁴Erwin Miklos, "Quantifying and Predicting Role-Expectations," Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1964. (Mimeographed.)

the perceptions which the principal has of his role are concerned.

Summary and Conclusions Related to Teacher Ratings

Hypotheses three, four, and five are also derived from the first major purpose of this study, which was to determine if the manner in which the principal perceives his role has an effect on the school as a whole. These hypotheses were concerned with descriptions of schools which are more subjective, being based on teacher judgments, than the first two hypotheses of this study.

As might be expected, the correlation among mean ratings of school effectiveness, mean teacher satisfaction, and mean ratings of principals' effectiveness were fairly high. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient for mean ratings of school effectiveness and mean teacher satisfaction was 0.515. For mean ratings of school effectiveness and mean ratings of principals' effectiveness, it was 0.529, and for mean teacher satisfaction and mean ratings of principals' effectiveness, it was 0.769. Thus, when these ratings are correlated with the principals' scores in the four dimensions it would be expected that there would be some similarity of results within each dimension. To some degree, this was the case.

Principals' scores in the Status Dimension are not significantly correlated with any of the three ratings. The values of "r" are so small as to indicate an almost complete lack of

relationship. This was also borne out when the schools were dichotomized on scores in the Status Dimension and "t" tests were run on the differences between means in each of the ratings. Hence, it must be concluded that in the schools sampled the manner in which the principal perceives his role in the Status Dimension has no effect on how teachers feel about the effectiveness of their school and of their principal, and on the degree of satisfaction which they feel with their teaching situation.

The statements and conclusions above, regarding the Status Dimension, apply with equal force to the Authority Dimension and the Means-Ends Dimension. Principals' perceptions in these two dimensions seem to have no effect on the ratings given by the teachers in this study.

The remaining dimension, the Personal Dimension, is significantly correlated with ratings of school effectiveness. The Pearson "r" value is -0.180 which meets the .05 level of confidence set for this study. This relationship indicates that a universalistic emphasis by the principal is associated with higher ratings of school effectiveness. When schools were dichotomized on the scores in the Personal Dimension, the difference between means in ratings of school effectiveness was significant at the .01 level, indicating that a difference as great as the one found here would occur by chance less than one time in a hundred. The con-

clusion is that principals' role perceptions in the Personal Dimension are significantly related to ratings given by teachers to the effectiveness of schools.

In the other two ratings, the Pearson "r" for the Personal Dimension does not reach significance. However, the relationship indicated in the first rating appears in both other ratings. Also, when schools are dichotomized in the other ratings, the values of "t" in the Personal Dimension approach significance at the .05 level of confidence.

To summarize this section it may be said that the evidence indicates an almost complete lack of relationship between the three ratings obtained in this study and the principals' scores in the Status, Authority, and Means-Ends Dimensions. Principals' scores in the Personal Dimension are significantly related to ratings of school effectiveness, and approach a significant relationship in the other two ratings.

Summary and Conclusions Related to Characteristics of Schools

A second major purpose of this study was to determine whether certain characteristics of the school and of the principal may be related to the manner in which he perceives his role. Hypotheses six and seven were concerned with characteristics of the school.

The characteristics of schools examined in this section of the study were school size, as measured by the number of teachers

in the school, and school type, based on grade levels found in the school. The absence of significant relationships between school size and the principal's role perceptions in the four dimensions was reported. In a study reported by Miklos no significant relationships were found between school size and the expectations held by the teachers for the behavior of the principal.⁵ Since teacher expectations are believed to have some influence on the role perceptions of the principals, the lack of relationships between school size and role perceptions by principals as reported here is understandable.

In the Personal Dimension, it was indicated by the variances that as schools become larger, principals tend to be less and less in agreement in perceptions of their role. It would appear that the principals of the larger schools tend to resolve the conflict in this area of universalistic and particularistic criteria by emphasizing either one or the other to a greater degree than do the principals in smaller schools. It is unknown whether this is forced on them by the organization and size of their schools, or whether it is the result of their need-dispositions and the selective practices employed in filling principalships of larger schools.

⁵Ibid.

When type of school is considered, the results in the Personal Dimension are again of special interest. Table XXXIX on page 96 showed that means in the Personal Dimension decrease as the grade median in the school increases; that is, principals become more particularistic in their behavior as grade median increases. Grade medians rise through the inclusion of higher grades in the school, and it is common for teachers with more training and higher specialization to teach these grades. Because of this, principals might be encouraged to apply particularist criteria in recognition of the variations among teachers. In the elementary schools, in contrast, where there is less departmentalization, and where there may be less variation in the amount and the substance of teachers' professional preparation, principals may be more likely to apply universalistic criteria. Because of this it is not surprising that the F value in the Personal Dimension, as shown in Table XL, is significant at the .01 level of confidence. The "t" tests show that the difference between means in the elementary schools and the secondary schools is greatest, as would be expected.

The differences in variances reported in Table XL on page 97 are great in the Personal and Means-Ends Dimensions. However, no pattern emerges, and no explanation for these differences seems available.

To summarize, it appears that school size does not affect the role perceptions of principals in the four dimensions under consideration. Nor does the type of school affect role perceptions of principals in the Status, Authority, and Means-Ends Dimensions. However, a strong relationship exists between type of school and the principals' perceptions in the Personal Dimension, and it appears that this may well be a causal relationship in that the type of school may affect the manner in which the principal perceives his role in this dimension.

Summary and Conclusions Related to Characteristics of Principals

Hypotheses eight, nine, ten, and eleven are also derived from the second major purpose of this study. These hypotheses were concerned with characteristics of the principals and the relationships these have to the manner in which he perceives his role. Experience and training were the characteristics of principals which were investigated.

No significant relationships were found between experience and training of principals and three of the four dimensions investigated--the Status, Authority, and Personal Dimensions. It would appear, however, that the experience of a principal has some effect on his perception of his role in the Means-Ends Dimension. The F ratio between the Means-Ends Dimension and total experience as teacher and principal approaches significance at the .05 level. When

experience as principal only is considered, this relationship is significant at the .05 level of confidence. The means indicate that principals with more experience emphasize process rather than product. The "t" tests in hypothesis nine indicate that principals with three years or less of experience in the principalship see their roles in this dimension in a significantly different manner from those who have from four to nine years of experience in the principalship. The absence of significant differences in means in other possible combinations of the three groups involved seems to indicate that factors other than experience may be influential. However, though the evidence is not strong there is reason to believe that experience has some effect on the role perceptions of principals in the Means-Ends Dimension.

Still considering the Means-Ends Dimension, it was found that the amount of training possessed by the principal did not seem to be related to his role perceptions. However, when attention was focused on whether or not the principal had completed some graduate work in educational administration, it was found that the difference in means was significant at the .05 level of confidence. Principals with graduate work in educational administration emphasized means or process, while those with no graduate work in educational administration emphasized ends or product.

One set of variances in the Means-Ends Dimension is of particular interest. The variances found in testing hypothesis nine,

which deals with experience in the principalship, show that the more experienced principals agree less in their perceptions of their roles in this dimension than do the less experienced principals.

Although the F ratios in the Status, Authority, and Personal Dimensions do not indicate significant relationships, some of the variances are quite revealing. The variances in hypotheses eight and nine indicate very clearly that principals with less experience perceive their roles in the Status Dimension in widely varying ways and that as they gain more experience they tend to agree more and more in their perceptions in this dimension. In the Personal Dimension the variances indicate that the less training principals have, the more they agree on their perceptions. It seems that more formal teaching preparation is associated with more widely varying perceptions in this dimension.

Neither experience nor preparation was found to have any relationship with the Authority Dimension. The conclusion by Miklos⁶ that more highly trained principals encourage independence of teachers receives no support from this study.

In summary, it may be said that the experience and training of principals have little effect on perceptions of their roles in the Status, Authority, and Personal Dimensions. Some relationship

⁶ Ibid.

is indicated with the Means-Ends Dimension, but the weakness of the evidence precludes definite conclusions.

Brief Discussion of the Study and Some Implications

It is difficult to determine whether the general lack of relationships in this study is an accurate description of reality or whether this lack of relationships may be attributed to other causes. Principals' perceptions in each dimension were determined from their responses to ten statements, half of which emphasized one extreme of behavior while the other half emphasized an opposite extreme of behavior. Principal ambivalence in responding may be one possible cause for the lack of definite relationships in the areas studied. It may be worthwhile for some work to be done on the Principal's Questionnaire to determine its validity in the measurement of role perceptions of principals. Another possible reason for the lack of relationships may be the wide age range of the respondents to the OCDQ and the questionnaire appended to it. If expectations for the behavior of principals differ among different age groups, these differing expectations, and the effects they would have on the responses to the OCDQ and on the ratings given by the teachers, may tend to cancel each other and to obscure relationships which actually exist. It may be advisable for future studies in this area to employ a more homogeneous sample or to be so designed that other variables would be controlled.

Initially, it was hoped that this study might result in some

rather definite conclusions which would then lead to firm recommendations regarding practice in the principalship. It was anticipated that the findings might have implications for preparatory programs for school administrators, for selection and placement practices, and for in-service programs. These expectations were not realized in full, but there are several implications arising from the findings which seem to be worthy of consideration.

There is, first, a rather general implication that the relationship between the personality, perceptions, or behavior of a principal and school climate may not be as simple as is often assumed. The Plaxton study reported that no overall relationships between the principal's personality type and climate were found.⁷ Now this study reports no overall relationship between role perceptions of principals and school climate, or climate subtest scores or the teachers' ratings on school effectiveness, principals' effectiveness and their own feelings of job satisfaction. It may be that there are wide discrepancies between what principals indicate the behavior of a principal should be and how they themselves behave. Consequently, future studies might profitably include provisions for observing principal behavior or for obtaining teachers' descriptions of principal behavior along various dimensions. It

⁷ Robert P. Plaxton, "Relationships Between Principal's Personality and the Organizational Climate of Their Schools" (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1965.)

may also be that the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire assesses only a small portion of what is often included under the concept of climate, and it may not do even this very well. As a result, further improvements in the instrument may be warranted. Until such time as there are improvements in methodology, design, and instrumentation, the relationship between principal characteristics and school climate remains obscure for the most part.

Some of the significant relationships do suggest more specific implications for practice in the principalship. First, it would seem that principals who wish to have high teacher Esprit should de-emphasize status differences and engage in egalitarian behavior. The findings in the Personal Dimension indicate that employment of universalistic criteria of behavior by the principal is associated with low Disengagement in the staff and with higher ratings of school effectiveness as judged by teachers. Since both results are considered to be desirable there is good reason for principals to use universalistic criteria in their relationships with teachers.

Another implication for practice arises from the observation that principals with more experience in the principalship tend to emphasize Means more than Ends. Perhaps care needs to be exercised by older, more experienced principals to insure that this tendency

does not become so strong as to result in a lack of concern for the achievement of ends.

The final implication is also found in the Means-Ends Dimension. The study shows that principals who have done graduate work in educational administration place more emphasis on the means by which things are done than on the accomplishment of ends. Since for some time the emphasis on democratic leadership was strong in graduate programs in educational administration, the implication is that graduate programs in educational administration may modify perceptions of the participants. This seems to suggest that if it were desired to emphasize certain directions in the other dimensions of principal's role perception, this might be accomplished by an appropriate emphasis in the preparation program.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Bartley, S.H. Principles of Perception. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1958.

Borg, Walter R. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1963.

Campbell, Roald F., John E. Corbally, and John A. Ramseyer. Introduction to Educational Administration. Second edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1963.

_____, and Russell T. Gregg (eds.). Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Costello, Timothy W., and Sheldon S. Zalkind. Psychology in Administration: A Research Orientation. Toronto: Prentice-Hall of Canada, 1963.

Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1959.

Gross, Neal, Ward S. Mason, and Alexander W. McEachern. Explorations in Role Analysis. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1958.

Halpin, Andrew W. (ed.). Administrative Theory in Education. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1958.

_____, and Don B. Croft. The Organizational Climate of Schools. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1963.

Hemphill, John K. Group Dimensions: A Manual For Their Measurement. Research Monograph Number 87. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, 1956.

Ittleson, W.H., and Hadley Cantril. Perception: A Transactional Approach. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1954.

Krech, David, and Richard S. Crutchfield. Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1948.

Lonsdale, Richard C. "Maintaining the Organization in Dynamic Equilibrium," Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, pp. 142-177. The Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Myers, Isabel B. Manual: The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1963.

Sarbin, Theodore R. "Role Theory," Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. I, Gardiner Lindzey, editor. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1954.

Seeman, Melvin. Social Status and Leadership. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University, Bureau of Educational Research and Service, 1960.

Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1956.

Sillito, M.T., and D.B. Black. The Alberta Teaching Force, 1964. Research Monograph Number 10. Edmonton: The Alberta Teachers' Association, 1965.

B. PERIODICALS

Anderson, L.W. "Teacher Morale and Student Achievement," Journal of Educational Research, 46:693-698, May, 1953.

Argyris, Chris. "Some Problems in Conceptualizing Organizational Climate: A Case Study of a Bank," Administrative Science Quarterly, 2:501-520, March, 1958.

Congreve, W.J. "Administrative Behavior and Staff Relations," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 6, No. 2, October, 1957.

Cornell, Francis G. "Socially Perceptive Administration," Phi Delta Kappan, 36:219-223, March, 1955.

Feldvebel, Alexander M. "Organizational Climate, Social Class, and Educational Output," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 12, No. 8, April, 1964.

Ferneau, F. "Which Consultant?" Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 2, No. 8, April, 1954.

Getzels, Jacob W. and Egon C. Guba. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review, 65:423-441, Winter, 1957.

Lipham, James M. "Organizational Character of Education: Administrative Behavior," Review of Educational Research, 34:435-450, October, 1964.

Miklos, Erwin. "Role Theory in Administration," Canadian Administrator, Vol. 3, No. 2, November, 1963.

Morin, L.H. "Role Perception and Principals," Canadian Administrator, Vol. 4, No. 5, February, 1965.

Moyer, D.C. "Leadership That Teachers Want," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 3, No. 7, March, 1955.

Zalkind, Sheldon S., and Timothy W. Costello. "Perception: Some Recent Research and Implications for Administration," Administrative Science Quarterly, 7:218-235, September, 1962.

C. UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Anderson, Donald. "Relationships Between Organizational Climate of Elementary Schools and Personal Variables of the Principals." A paper delivered at the Conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, February 10, 1965.

Andrews, John H.M. "Some Validity Studies of the OCDQ." A paper delivered at the Conference of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, February 10, 1965.

Brown, A. "Changing Climate." A paper delivered to the Council on School Administration Clinics on Organizational Climate, Edmonton, March 20, 1965 and Calgary, March 27, 1965.

Fast, R.G. "Leader Behavior of Principals As It Relates to Teacher Satisfaction." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.

Jensen, Leland Edward. "Teachers' Professional Responsibilities: An Interpersonal Perception Study." Unpublished Doctoral thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1963. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts 24:2336; No. 6, 1963.

Miklos, Erwin. "Dimensions of Conflicting Expectations and the Leader Behavior of Principals." Unpublished Doctoral thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1963.

_____. "Organizational Climate and Program Development." Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1964. (Mimeo graphed.)

_____. "Organizational Climate: The Concept and the Instrument." Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1964. (Mimeo graphed.)

_____. "Quantifying and Predicting Role-Expectations." Edmonton: Department of Educational Administration, University of Alberta, 1964. (Mimeo graphed.)

Morin, L.H. "The Principal's Perception of His Role." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1964.

Plaxton, Robert P. "Relationships Between Principals' Personality and the Organizational Climate of Their Schools." Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, 1965.

Thorin, Frederick D. "A Study to Determine the Accuracy With Which Selected Secondary School Principals Perceive the Role Expectations Held For Them by Their Staff and Superintendent." Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Wayne State University, Detroit, 1961. Abstract: Dissertation Abstracts 22:480-481; No. 2, 1961.

Schmidt, Werner G. "Relationships Between Certain Aspects of Leader Behavior and Organizational Climate." Master's thesis in preparation, University of Alberta, Edmonton.

APPENDIX

ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Developed by

ANDREW W. HALPIN

and

DON B. CROFT

On the following pages is a list of items that are used to describe the organizational climate or the "personality" of your school. The items describe typical behaviors or conditions that occur within a school. Please indicate to what extent each of these descriptions characterizes **your school**. Please do **not** evaluate the items in terms of "good" or "bad" behavior but read each item carefully and respond in terms of how well the statement describes your school.

It is important that your answers be "independent," so please do not discuss your answers with other teachers. Though there is no time limit, it will probably take you 15 to 20 minutes to complete.

Please be frank in your response with the assurance that individual responses are strictly confidential.

IDENTIFICATION: Please write the name and address of your school on the envelope provided for the completed questionnaire; do NOT write your name on this questionnaire.

Each questionnaire will be given a code number and all responses transferred to IBM cards for processing. Complete anonymity in the analysis of data and the reporting of findings is assured.

DIRECTIONS:

- a. READ each item carefully.
- b. THINK about how well the statement describes your school.
- c. DECIDE whether the behavior or condition described in the item occurs rarely, sometimes, often, or very frequently in your school.
- d. DRAW A CIRCLE around one of the four letters following the item to show the answer you have selected.

A=Very frequently occurs

B=Often occurs

C=Sometimes occurs

D=Rarely occurs

Please respond to EVERY item.

1. Teachers' closest friends are other faculty members at this school.	A	B	C	D
2. The mannerisms of teachers at this school are annoying.	A	B	C	D
3. Teachers spend time after school with students who have individual problems.	A	B	C	D
4. Instructions for the operation of teaching aids are available.	A	B	C	D
5. Teachers invite other faculty members to visit them at home.	A	B	C	D
6. There is a minority group of teachers who always oppose the majority.	A	B	C	D
7. Extra books are available for classroom use.	A	B	C	D
8. Sufficient time is given to prepare administrative reports.	A	B	C	D
9. Teachers know the family background of other faculty members.	A	B	C	D
10. Teachers exert group pressure on non-conforming faculty members.	A	B	C	D
11. In faculty meetings, there is the feeling of "let's get things done."	A	B	C	D
12. Administrative paper work is burdensome at this school.	A	B	C	D
13. Teachers talk about their personal life to other faculty members.	A	B	C	D
14. Teachers seek special favors from the principal.	A	B	C	D
15. School supplies are readily available for use in classwork.	A	B	C	D
16. Student progress reports require too much work.	A	B	C	D
17. Teachers have fun socializing together during school time.	A	B	C	D
18. Teachers interrupt other faculty members who are talking in staff meetings.	A	B	C	D
19. Most of the teachers here accept the faults of their colleagues.	A	B	C	D
20. Teachers have too many committee requirements.	A	B	C	D
21. There is considerable laughter when teachers gather informally.	A	B	C	D
22. Teachers ask nonsensical questions in faculty meetings.	A	B	C	D
23. Custodial service is available when needed.	A	B	C	D
24. Routine duties interfere with the job of teaching.	A	B	C	D
25. Teachers prepare administrative reports by themselves.	A	B	C	D

26. Teachers ramble when they talk in faculty meetings.	A	B	C	D
27. Teachers at this school show much school spirit.	A	B	C	D
28. The principal goes out of his way to help teachers.	A	B	C	D
29. The principal helps teachers solve personal problems.	A	B	C	D
30. Teachers at this school stay by themselves.	A	B	C	D
31. The teachers accomplish their work with great vim, vigor, and pleasure.	A	B	C	D
32. The principal sets an example by working hard himself.	A	B	C	D
33. The principal does personal favors for teachers.	A	B	C	D
34. Teachers eat lunch by themselves in their own classrooms.	A	B	C	D
35. The morale of the teachers is high.	A	B	C	D
36. The principal uses constructive criticism.	A	B	C	D
37. The principal stays after school to help teachers finish their work.	A	B	C	D
38. Teachers socialize together in small select groups.	A	B	C	D
39. The principal makes all class-scheduling decisions.	A	B	C	D
40. Teachers are contacted by the principal each day.	A	B	C	D
41. The principal is well prepared when he speaks at school functions.	A	B	C	D
42. The principal helps staff members settle minor differences.	A	B	C	D
43. The principal schedules the work for the teachers.	A	B	C	D
44. Teachers leave the grounds during the school day.	A	B	C	D
45. Teachers help select which courses will be taught.	A	B	C	D
46. The principal corrects teachers' mistakes.	A	B	C	D
47. The principal talks a great deal.	A	B	C	D
48. The principal explains his reasons for criticism to teachers.	A	B	C	D
49. The principal tries to get better salaries for teachers.	A	B	C	D
50. Extra duty for teachers is posted conspicuously.	A	B	C	D
51. The rules set by the principal are never questioned.	A	B	C	D
52. The principal looks out for the personal welfare of teachers.	A	B	C	D
53. School secretarial service is available for teachers' use.	A	B	C	D
54. The principal runs the faculty meeting like a business conference.	A	B	C	D
55. The principal is in the building before teachers arrive.	A	B	C	D
56. Teachers work together preparing administrative reports.	A	B	C	D
57. Faculty meetings are organized according to a tight agenda.	A	B	C	D
58. Faculty meetings are mainly principal-report meetings.	A	B	C	D
59. The principal tells teachers of new ideas he has run across.	A	B	C	D
60. Teachers talk about leaving the school system.	A	B	C	D
61. The principal checks the subject-matter ability of teachers.	A	B	C	D
62. The principal is easy to understand.	A	B	C	D
63. Teachers are informed of the results of a supervisor's visit.	A	B	C	D
64. The principal insures that teachers work to their full capacity.	A	B	C	D

(OVER)

SOME INFORMATION ABOUT YOU AND YOUR SCHOOL

65. Number of teachers in your school, including the principal (check one):
- (1) 4 or fewer
..... (2) 5 to 9
..... (3) 10 to 14
..... (4) 15 to 19
..... (5) 20 to 24
..... (6) 25 to 29
..... (7) 30 to 39
..... (8) 40 to 49
..... (9) 50 or more
66. What grades does your school include? Check the one below which most closely describes your school.
- (1) Gr. 1 to 6
..... (2) Gr. 1 to 8
..... (3) Gr. 1 to 9
..... (4) Gr. 1 to 11
..... (5) Gr. 1 to 12
..... (6) Gr. 7 to 9
..... (7) Gr. 7 to 12
..... (8) Gr. 9 to 12
..... (9) Gr. 10 to 12
67. How long have you been in your present school, including this year?
- (1) 1 yr.
..... (2) 2 yrs.
..... (3) 3 or 4 yrs.
..... (4) 5 or 6 yrs.
..... (5) 7 to 8 yrs.
..... (6) 9 or 10 years
..... (7) 11 to 15 yrs.
..... (8) 16 to 20 yrs.
..... (9) 21 yrs. or more
68. How many years of teaching experience do you have, including the present year?
- (1) 1 yr.
..... (2) 2 yrs.
..... (3) 3 or 4 yrs.
..... (4) 5 or 6 yrs.
..... (5) 7 or 8 yrs.
..... (6) 9 or 10 yrs.
..... (7) 11 to 15 yrs.
..... (8) 16 to 20 yrs.
..... (9) 21 yrs. or more
69. Your sex:
- (1) Male
..... (2) Female
70. What is your age?
- (1) under 24 yrs.
..... (2) 25-29 yrs.
..... (3) 30-34 yrs.
..... (4) 35-39 yrs.
..... (5) 40-44 yrs.
..... (6) 45-49 yrs.
..... (7) 50-54 yrs.
..... (8) 55-59 yrs.
..... (9) 60 yrs. and over
71. How many years of training are you credited with for salary purposes? (Please drop fractional years).
- (1) 1 yr.
..... (2) 2 yrs.
..... (3) 3 yrs.
..... (4) 4 yrs.
..... (5) 5 yrs.
..... (6) 6 yrs.
72. Compared with other schools known to you, how good a job do you judge your school does in educating the students who come to it? (check one)
- (1) outstanding
..... (2) very good
..... (3) slightly above average
..... (4) slightly below average
..... (5) poor
..... (6) very poor
73. If you are the principal please check here (1) and omit the next two items.
74. How well satisfied are you with all aspects of your teaching situation in your present school? (check one)
- (1) enthusiastic
..... (2) satisfied
..... (3) fairly well satisfied
..... (4) somewhat dissatisfied
..... (5) dissatisfied
..... (6) very dissatisfied
75. How effective do you consider your principal to be in performing all the various functions which he should perform? (This item is for research purposes only and even averages of scores are strictly confidential).
- (1) outstanding,
..... (2) very good
..... (3) slightly above average
..... (4) slightly below average
..... (5) poor
..... (6) very poor

76. 77. 78. 79. 80.

(Thank you. Write name and address of school on envelope)

CSA CLINIC ON ORGANIZATION CLIMATE

PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

IDENTIFICATION: Please write the name of your school on the envelope provided for the completed questionnaire; do **not** write your name on this questionnaire.

Each questionnaire will be given an identifying code number and all responses transferred to IBM cards for processing. Complete anonymity in the analysis of data and the reporting of findings is assured.

Please reply to each item.

A. SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

1. What grades does your school include? Check the one which most closely describes your school.

- (1) Gr. 1 to 6
- (2) Gr. 1 to 8
- (3) Gr. 1 to 9
- (4) Gr. 1 to 11
- (5) Gr. 1 to 12
- (6) Gr. 7 to 9
- (7) Gr. 7 to 12
- (8) Gr. 9 to 12
- (9) Gr. 10 to 12

2. How many full-time teachers are there in your school? Include yourself as principal in the total.

- (1) 4 or fewer
- (2) 5 to 9
- (3) 10 to 14
- (4) 15 to 19
- (5) 20 to 24
- (6) 25 to 29
- (7) 30 to 39
- (8) 40 to 49
- (9) 50 or more

3. How many of the teachers included in (2) have been teaching in this school for less than one full year? Check only one.

- (1) One or more
- (2) Two
- (3) Three
- (4) Four
- (5) Five
- (6) Six
- (7) Seven
- (8) Eight
- (9) Nine or more

B. ADMINISTRATIVE CHARACTERISTICS (Check one response for each question)

4. How many days per week are you allowed for administration and supervision in your school?

- (1) One-half day or less
- (2) 1 or 1.5 days
- (3) 2 or 2.5 days
- (4) 3 or 3.5 days
- (5) 4 or 4.5 days
- (6) Five days

5. How much secretarial help do you have in terms of days per week?

- (1) None
- (2) One-half day or less
- (3) 1 or 1.5 days
- (4) 2 or 2.5 days
- (5) 3 or 3.5 days
- (6) 4 or 4.5 days
- (7) Five days

6. Counting the present school year, what is the total years of experience you have had as teacher and principal? Check one.

- (1) 4 years or less
- (2) 5 to 8 years
- (3) 9 to 12 years
- (4) 13 to 16 years
- (5) 17 to 20 years
- (6) 21 to 23 years
- (7) 24 to 27 years
- (8) 28 to 31 years
- (9) 32 years or more

7. Counting the present school year, what is the total years of experience you have had as principal?

- (1) 1 years
- (2) 2 to 3 years
- (3) 4 to 6 years
- (4) 7 to 9 years
- (5) 10 to 12 years
- (6) 13 to 15 years
- (7) 16 to 18 years
- (8) 19 to 20 years
- (9) 21 years or more

8. How long have you been principal of this school, including the present year?
- (1) 1 year
..... (2) 2 years
..... (3) 3 or 4 years
..... (4) 5 or 6 years
..... (5) 7 or 8 years
..... (6) 9 to 10 years
..... (7) 11 to 15 years
..... (8) 16 to 20 years
..... (9) 21 years or more
9. Your sex:
- (1) Male
..... (2) Female
10. What is your age?
- (1) Under 24 years
..... (2) 25 to 29 years
..... (3) 30 to 34 years
..... (4) 35 to 39 years
..... (5) 40 to 44 years
..... (6) 45 to 49 years
..... (7) 50 to 54 years
..... (8) 55 to 59 years
..... (9) 60 years or over
11. How many years of training are you credited with for salary purposes? Please drop fractional years.
- (1) 1 year
..... (2) 2 years
..... (3) 3 years
..... (4) 4 years
..... (5) 5 years
..... (6) 6 years
12. How much graduate work have you done in educational administration?
- (1) No graduate university courses in administration
..... (2) Some courses in administration
..... (3) Hold a graduate degree in educational administration.
13. What position did you have last year? Check only one.
- (1) Principal of this school
..... (2) Principal of another school
..... (3) Vice-principal or department head in this school
..... (4) Vice-principal or department head in another school
..... (5) Teacher in this school
..... (6) Teacher in another school
..... (7) Other, state

C. BEHAVIOUR OF PRINCIPALS

Please react to each of the items in this section by **circling** one of the five responses according to the following key:

SA—Strongly agree
D—Disagree

A—Agree

U—Uncertain
SD—Strongly Disagree

- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| 14. A principal should think of himself as being one of the teachers in the school. | SA A U D SD |
| 15. A principal should spend as much time supervising playgrounds, hallways, and extra-curricular activities as any of the teachers in his school. | SA A U D SD |
| 16. If a principal has lunch at school, he should associate with those teachers who are also at school during the lunch hour as one of their equals. | SA A U D SD |
| 17. In a fairly large school the principal should ask teachers to make appointments to see him rather than to come to his office whenever they wish. | SA A U D SD |
| 18. A principal should be more like a superintendent than like a teacher. | SA A U D SD |
| 19. Within the school a principal should try to be just another member of the group in his job relations. | SA A U D SD |
| 20. Even though he may have less training and/or experience than some teachers, the opinions of a principal should carry more weight than those of the teachers in the school. | SA A U D SD |
| 21. A principal should not strive to achieve a higher social position in the community than that of the teachers in his school. | SA A U D SD |
| 22. A principal should keep a certain professional distance between himself and the teachers in his school. | SA A U D SD |
| 23. If a teacher and a principal disagree over a matter of classroom procedure, the principal should expect the teacher to yield to his point of view. | SA A U D SD |
| 24. (Item omitted from this questionnaire) | |
| 25. (Item omitted from this questionnaire) | |

26. A principal should not do anything to help a teacher who is having teaching difficulties until the teacher comes to him for help. SA A U D SD
27. A principal should expect teachers to consult with him before making any major decisions about promotions. SA A U D SD
28. A principal should visit regularly the classes of those teachers who are weak in discipline in an attempt to keep the classes under control. SA A U D SD
29. A principal should expect teachers who are new to the school to fit themselves into the established policies and procedures in the school. SA A U D SD
30. A principal should not encourage teachers to look to him for help with controlling their classes. SA A U D SD
31. A principal should check grades assigned to pupils before these are placed on records or report cards. SA A U D SD
32. A principal should allow teachers to work out their classroom problems by themselves. SA A U D SD
33. A principal should expect teachers to submit for his approval copies of major examinations which they plan to administer. SA A U D SD
34. A principal should encourage teachers to refer serious behavioral problems to him only as a last resort. SA A U D SD
35. In delegating some definite non-teaching duties to teachers, a principal should give them full authority to act as they see fit. SA A U D SD
36. (Item omitted from this questionnaire)
37. (Item omitted from this questionnaire)

38. A principal should not visit the homes of some teachers any more often than he visits the homes of others. SA A U D SD
39. A principal should not expect all teachers to take part in supervising hallways, playgrounds, and extra-curricular activities. SA A U D SD
40. A principal should invite teachers to his home only as a group if he invites them at all. SA A U D SD
41. A principal should be willing to give special privileges to teachers who are very effective in the classroom. SA A U D SD
42. A principal should restrict his relationships with staff members to the formal requirements in order to avoid preferential treatment of some teachers. SA A U D SD
43. A principal should be more concerned with qualifications than with preferences when assigning teaching duties. SA A U D SD
44. A principal should not permit a close relative to be on his teaching staff. SA A U D SD
45. A principal should take into account such personal obligations of teachers as family responsibilities when assigning extra-curricular duties. SA A U D SD
46. A principal should do personal favors for staff members. SA A U D SD
47. When assigning teaching duties, a principal should be cognizant of the out-of-school responsibilities of a teacher. SA A U D SD
48. (Item omitted from this questionnaire)
49. (Item omitted from this questionnaire)

50. A principal should operate on the assumption that people are concerned about participating in making decisions which will affect them. SA A U D SD
51. A principal should not hesitate to depart from official procedures if it means that certain tasks will be carried out more effectively. SA A U D SD
52. A principal should keep pupils, parents and teachers informed about policy changes which are being considered. SA A U D SD
53. A principal should not call a staff meeting unless he has something of importance to discuss with the staff. SA A U D SD
54. A principal should strive to interest teachers in the administration of the school. SA A U D SD
55. A principal should not hesitate to go against the wishes of his staff on a matter of school policy if he considers it necessary to do so. SA A U D SD
56. A principal should delay action until there is staff consensus before proceeding with a staff project. SA A U D SD
57. A principal should not feel obligated to consult all teachers on his staff if he believes he can obtain the views of the staff by contacting only a few teachers. SA A U D SD
58. A principal need not involve his staff in formulating school policies in order to run a school efficiently. SA A U D SD
59. A principal should recognize that there is greater value in operating a school democratically than in doing some tasks more quickly by less democratic means. SA A U D SD
60. (Item omitted from this questionnaire)
61. (Item omitted from this questionnaire)

D. ABOUT YOUR SCHOOL

Please check one response for each question

62. What proportion of your present teaching staff is quite difficult to get to know?
- (1) nearly all
..... (2) about three-quarters
..... (3) slightly more than one-half
..... (4) slightly less than one-half
..... (5) about one-quarter
..... (6) almost none
63. What proportion of your staff is slow to return completed reports or to provide information required by the school or the school system?
- (1) nearly all
..... (2) about three-quarters
..... (3) slightly more than one-half
..... (4) slightly less than one-half
..... (5) about one-quarter
..... (6) almost none
64. What proportion of the teachers on your staff come to you for advice on some of their teaching problems?
- (1) nearly all
..... (2) about three-quarters
..... (3) slightly more than one-half
..... (4) slightly less than one-half
..... (5) about one-quarter
..... (6) almost none
65. What proportion of your staff is highly interested in trying out new ideas and in improving the school generally?
- (1) nearly all
..... (2) about three-quarters
..... (3) slightly more than one-half
..... (4) slightly less than one-half
..... (5) about one-quarter
..... (6) almost none
66. What proportion of the teachers on your staff seem to be unable to solve problems which they should be able to solve independently?
- (1) nearly all
..... (2) about three-quarters
..... (3) slightly more than one-half
..... (4) slightly less than one-half
..... (5) about one-quarter
..... (6) almost none
67. What proportion of your staff occasionally discuss some personal problems with you?
- (1) nearly all
..... (2) about three-quarters
..... (3) slightly more than one-half
..... (4) slightly less than one-half
..... (5) about one-quarter
..... (6) almost none
68. What proportion of your staff spends a considerable amount of time in informal socializing?
- (1) nearly all
..... (2) about three-quarters
..... (3) slightly more than one-half
..... (4) slightly less than one-half
..... (5) about one-quarter
..... (6) almost none
69. What proportion of the teachers in your school seem to find it difficult to work with other teachers or in groups on school projects?
- (1) nearly all
..... (2) about three-quarters
..... (3) slightly more than one-half
..... (4) slightly less than one-half
..... (5) about one-quarter
..... (6) almost none
70. Compared with other schools known to you, how good a job do you judge your school does in educating students who come to it?
- (1) outstanding
..... (2) very good
..... (3) slightly above average
..... (4) slightly below average
..... (5) poor
..... (6) very poor

E. ABOUT THE JOB.

(Please check one response to each question)

71. How well do you like the work that you are called upon to do as principal?

- (1) Dislike it very much; would prefer to leave the principalship.
- (2) Don't like it very much; other jobs in education I would like better.
- (3) It is all right, but there are other jobs I would like just as much.
- (4) Like it very much; however, there are other jobs I would like just as much.
- (5) Like it very much; it is the kind of work I like best.

72. How do you feel about the influence which you have had on this school since you became principal?

- (1) Have been able to do very little to improve the school.
- (2) Have made some improvements but should have made more.
- (3) Have made about as many improvements as could be made under the circumstances.
- (4) Have been able to make more improvements than might have been anticipated.

73. How would you describe this school as a place in which to work as a principal?

- (1) It is a very difficult school for a principal.
- (2) There are many problems, but one can get by.
- (3) It is about average; most of the problems can be solved.
- (4) It is slightly above average, but there are probably better schools.
- (5) It is a very good school from the principal's point of view; it would be difficult to find one as good.

74.

75.

76.

(Items 74 to 80 inclusive have been omitted
from the questionnaire. Please continue with
No. 81).

77.

78.

79.

80.

F. REACTIONS TO THE JOB

The following items suggest aspects of the principalship which may create tensions in persons occupying such a position. Please respond to each of the items by indicating how frequently you feel bothered by it according to the following key:

A—Never B—Rarely C—Sometimes D—Often E—Nearly all the time

CIRCLE one response for EACH item.

81. Feeling that you have too little authority to carry out the responsibilities associated with your position. A B C D E
82. Being unclear on just what the scope and responsibilities of the principalship are. A B C D E
83. Feeling that you have a workload that you can't possibly finish in an ordinary workday. A B C D E
84. Not knowing what opportunities for advancement and promotion exist in administrative work. A B C D E
85. Thinking that you will not be able to meet the conflicting demands made of you. A B C D E
86. Feeling that you are not fully qualified for an administrative position. A B C D E
87. Not knowing how the superintendent and board evaluate your performance. A B C D E
88. Having to decide things that affect the lives of teachers and pupils. A B C D E
89. Feeling that you may not be liked or accepted by the people you work with. A B C D E
90. Feeling unable to influence the decisions of those at higher levels whose decisions affect you. A B C D E
91. Not knowing what people in the school and the community expect of you. A B C D E

92. Thinking that the amount of work you do affects how well you A B C D E
do it.
93. Feeling that your job interferes with your family life.
94. Feeling that there is too much authority and responsibility associated with an administrative position. A B C D E
95. Feeling that details take up too much time while important matters are left undone. A B C D E

(THANK YOU. Please make certain that the name and address of school appear on the envelope)

1965 CLINIC ON ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Sponsored by: The Council on School Administration (ATA) and the Dept. of Educational Administration, U of A, Edmonton

TO THE PRINCIPAL

This package contains two types of questionnaires:

- (1) The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (10 copies)
- (2) A Principal's Questionnaire (1 copy)

PROCEDURES FOR ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

This questionnaire is to be completed by the principal and nine other members of the staff. The scores on the Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire will be the basis for discussion at the CSA Clinic for which you registered earlier. If the responses are to be useful for describing the climate of your school, it is important that the teachers who complete the questionnaire can be certain that their responses to the questions will be seen by no one but the analysts at the university. For this reason we ask that you follow this procedure:

- (1) REMOVE ONE climate questionnaire and one envelope for YOUR OWN use.
- (2) CHOOSE a responsible member of your staff to act as a COORDINATOR; he will be responsible for administering, collecting, and mailing the questionnaires. Turn over to him the other nine climate questionnaires and the instructions included.
- (3) COMPLETE your copy of the climate questionnaire and seal it in the envelope provided.

PROCEDURE FOR PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

Last year's clinics revealed that participants were interested in the relationship of school, staff, and principal variables to the climate of the school; this becomes highly relevant when questions are raised concerning the improvement of school climates. Questions were also raised concerning the exact meaning of some of the scores which the climate questionnaire yields. The principal's questionnaire has been designed to provide data for analyses which may give some insights into these highly important relationships. The results of the analyses will be used as a basis for some of the discussion at the clinics this year.

Please respond to all of the questions even though a few of them overlap with the questions on the last page of the climate questionnaire. Data analysis will be facilitated if all questions on both questionnaires are answered.

Place completed questionnaire in the envelope and seal.

RETURNING COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRES

Hand both envelopes containing your completed questionnaires to the Coordinator for mailing with the questionnaires completed by the staff.

Please accept our thanks for your cooperation and for your interest in this project.

1965 CLINIC ON ORGANIZATIONAL CLIMATE

Sponsored by: The Council on School Administration (ATA) and the Dept. of Educational Administration, U.of A. Edmonton

TO THE COORDINATOR

The Organizational Climate Description Questionnaires which have been handed to you are to be completed by you and eight other members of the staff. The principal is also completing one copy of this questionnaire as well as another instrument separately. It is very important that the teachers completing the questionnaires do not discuss the questions with each other before responding to them. Please follow this procedure:

- (1) SELECT THE TEACHERS who will complete the questionnaire.
 - (a) If your staff has more than eight full-time teachers other than yourself and the principal, it is essential that those who complete the questionnaire be chosen at random. To ensure random selection place the names of all members of the staff (other than yourself and the principal) in a container and draw eight names.
 - (b) If your staff has eight or fewer staff members other than yourself and the principal, have all members of the staff complete the questionnaires and return any unused copies with the completed forms.
- (2) ARRANGE A MEETING.
 - (a) Schedule a period of about thirty minutes when the selected staff members (including yourself but excluding the principal) can complete the questionnaire at the same time.
 - (b) After the group has assembled, distribute a questionnaire and an envelope to each staff member.
- (3) READ THE FOLLOWING DIRECTIONS TO THE GROUP:
 - (a) "Read carefully the directions on the front page and on the top of the first inside page. Your responses to the items are strictly confidential and will be seen by no one but the analysts at the university. Please do not discuss the questions with members of this group before responding."
 - (b) "Complete the questionnaire by responding to each item. Notice that there are questions on the back page also."
 - (c) "Place the completed questionnaire in the envelope provided, seal it, and hand it to me as soon as you have finished."
- (4) COORDINATOR AND GROUP MEMBERS COMPLETE QUESTIONNAIRE
- (5) Please thank the staff members for their cooperation and accept our thanks yourself.
- (6) Make certain that the name of your school appears on each envelope.
- (7) PLACE THE ENVELOPES CONTAINING THE QUESTIONNAIRES COMPLETED BY YOURSELF, BY THE PRINCIPAL (2 questionnaires), AND BY THE OTHER STAFF MEMBERS IN THE LARGE SELF-ADDRESSED ENVELOPE AND MAIL BEFORE FEBRUARY 12.

KEY FOR PART C OF PRINCIPAL'S QUESTIONNAIRE

14. 12345	26. 54321	38. 54321	50. 54321
15. 12345	27. 12345	39. 12345	51. 12345
16. 12345	28. 12345	40. 54321	52. 54321
17. 54321	29. 12345	41. 12345	53. 12345
18. 54321	30. 54321	42. 54321	54. 54321
19. 12345	31. 12345	43. 54321	55. 12345
20. 54321	32. 54321	44. 54321	56. 54321
21. 12345	33. 12345	45. 12345	57. 12345
22. 54321	34. 54321	46. 12345	58. 12345
23. 54321	35. 54321	47. 12345	59. 54321

B29845